DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 703 CE 068 774

TITLE	Skills Today for Advancement Tomorrow (STAT). A National Workplace Literacy Partnership. Final Performance Report.
INSTITUTION	Saint Louis Community Coll., Mo.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC. National Workplace Literacy Program.
PUB DATE	Mar 95
CONTRACT	V198A30199
NOTE	135p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Basic Skills; Community Colleges; Education Work Relationship; Formative Evaluation; Institutional Cooperation; Job Performance; Labor Force Development; *On the Job Training; *Outcomes of Education; *Partnerships in Education; *School Business Relationship; *Skill Development; Summative Evaluation; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	Focus Groups; National Workplace Literacy Program; *Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

The 18-month Skills Today for Advancement Tomorrow (STAT) program, a partnership among St. Louis Community College, the St. Louis Public Schools' Adult Basic Education Program, and Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri, had the following objectives: (1) provide counseling and training for 370 current Blue Cross and Blue Shield workers; (2) develop a training referral system for 60 unemployed disadvantaged adults; (3) develop model assessment and evaluation systems for health care benefits workers; (4) develop and validate competency-based basic skills curriculums; and (5) develop and implement innovative methods for involving workers in all aspects of STAT's program development. During the program, 515 participants were served with classes for the Blue Cross/Blue Shield workers; 60 clients were served through the partnership between the Adult Basic Education program and the STAT program; model assessment tools and model curricula were developed; and worker involvement was encouraged through one-to-one counseling, feedback questionnaires and focus group sessions. Participants from the insurance company improved their performance ratings and customer satisfaction ratings. (Project documents, including questionnaires, a sample curriculum and a list of dissemination activities, are included in the report.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 380 703

A National Workplace Literacy Partnership
Final Performance Report

St. Louis Community College

March 1995

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE 068 774

Table of Contents

		Page
Introduction		1
I.	Actual Accomplishments	4
II.	Schedule for Implementation	8
III.	Participant Demographics	8
IV.	Dissemination Activities	8
V.	Evaluation Activities	9
VI.	Staff Changes	9

Attachment 1: Sample Curriculum

Attachment 2: List of Dissemination Activities

Skills Today for Advancement Tomorrow (STAT) Project

PR Award V198A30199

Final Performance Report

March 20, 1995

The ***Skills Today for Advancement Tomorrow*** program (hereinafter referred to as STAT) was funded from March 1, 1993 through December 31, 1994. (The original grant that was funded for 18 months was allowed a no-cost extension affording four additional months for program operation.) Partners included the *Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri (BCBSMo), the St. Louis Public School's Adult Basic Education Program (ABE), and the grantee, St. Louis Community College.*

The STAT goal was to focus on the workplace literacy training needs of the BCBSMo health care benefits industry. The five objectives for the project were to:

(1) Provide counseling and training for 370 current Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri workers, including literacy skills such as reasoning, concentration, memory, problem solving, reading, writing, speaking, listening, and computation skills (300 workers) and pre-technical "imaging" skills (70 workers);

(2) Develop a recruitment and training referral system for 60 unemployed, disadvantaged adults to gain those skills necessary to successfully compete as applicants for employment at BCBSMo or similar work environments;

(3) Develop model assessment and evaluation systems which will create new qualitative and quantitative measurement tools for health care benefits industry workers;

(4) Develop, validate, refine, reproduce, and disseminate systematic basic skills curricula that are competency based and transferable to other similar industries;

(5) Develop and implement innovative methods for involving workers in all aspects of STAT's program development.

During the STAT grant numerous changes occurred in the Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri organization. The company moved its headquarters to a new, downtown location. Two downtown St. Louis sites housed the BCBSMo staff. Considerable down-sizing and restructuring occurred within all departments, and the company changed its status from a not-for-profit organization to a publicly licensened and incorporated company, now called *Alliance Blue Cross and Blue Shield.* Since STAT was operational at the time of the company's transitional period, we were positioned to provide much-needed services to this workforce. The partnership provided basic skill enhancement that assisted workers keep jobs, gain skills needed to compete for new jobs, or prepare to find jobs elsewhere. The project's objectives, while doable, needed to conform to the perceived needs of the company and were adjusted to the culture of the company over the project period, as any viable workplace literacy program must do in order to be successful. Hence, some of the planned details and priorities had to be augmented and refined to apply to the "real world" of this workplace.

Two educational partners working with one business partner also provided many learning experiences. Merging three separate organizational structures into one "holistic" team was at times awkward and difficult. Conflicting needs, such as the Adult Basic Education's rigid enrollment requirements of attendance, participation numbers, testing procedures, and reporting procedures were not known in advance of the project's implementation. Though efforts were made to adjust the

program to "fit" these real constraints, the scope of the Adult Basic Education program's participation was narrowed from the projected plan. However, the STAT program provided ABE with a real opportunity to gain new insights into workplace literacy training, and ABE shared many responsibilities for program implementation including staff selection, program planning (especially in regard to how we could serve the external participants), and project evaluation. At times all three organizational needs could not be met, and in the STAT program, the BCBSMo needs took priority over the educational organizations' needs.

The process for integrating St. Louis Community College staff with BCBSMo staff was dynamic and, though at first quite slow, gained momentum throughout the project. St. Louis Community College personnel worked alongside BCBSMo personnel. Daily planning and implementation of each activity blended roles for both Coordinators (one Project Coordinator and one BCBSMo Coordinator). The ultimate evidence of the full cooperation between the BCBSMo and St. Louis Community College staffs was in the evaluation data collection period toward the end of the project. It was due to this organizational "harmonizing" that many outcomes were realized in the STAT project.

The project evaluation was conducted by Dr. Sharon Slane. Her outstanding contributions provided guidance during the formative evaluation period and through the completion of the summative evaluation. Dr. Slane participated in partner meetings, giving direction toward the stated objectives. She observed every facet of the program in operation, led focus group feedback sessions with participants, supervisors and staff, composed the data collection system instruments, provided a timely mid-project report (the formative evaluation report), and the final evaluation report. In brief, Dr. Slane fulfilled her role as the "objective" evaluator. Her efforts heightened the project's efforts

throughout the funding period, and with the final report, documentation is available which will doubtless benefit St. Louis Community College's future workplace literacy efforts as will the work of other workplace literacy programs, when applied.

Since a comprehensive final evaluation report is provided, specific details, including the data collection system, instruments, and project outcomes, are available in that document. This report will detail some of the learning gained through the partnership, the staff development activities (which provided excellent professional growth for the instructional team), and dissemination efforts that were provided during the grant and have been continued throughout these months beyond the grant period.

Per the instructions provided by the U. S. Department of Education, the following segments in this report respond to the "reporting requirements" and are identified as Roman Numerals I through VI.

I. Actual accomplishments related to the specified objectives are:

Objective 1: **515 participants** were served during the grant (370 were specified). Courses were developed to respond to the workers' needs including brush-up courses in reading and math, effective communication skills, memory and concentration skills development, and study skills. Class formats were highly innovative with a variety of formats including short courses being provided during lunch times, brief seminars, "take home" packets, and workshops. BCBSMo purchased computers, and the STAT program assisted in the implementation of a computerized learning and resource center. Workers attended classes voluntarily at two work sites, both within the BCBSMo environments.

Two significant project outcomes are the institutionalization of the STAT program at Alliance BCBS, and the release time that is now

provided to workers who participate in STAT courses (on-going classes are now provided by Alliance BCBS with purchased services from St. Louis Community College when needed).

The "imaging" classes which were originally planned were not provided through the grant; however, BCBSMo provided the training that was required to get the workforce up-to-speed on the new "imaging" system.

Objective 2: 60 clients were served through the partnership between the St. Louis Public School's Adult Basic Education program and the STAT program. Since BCBSMo was downsizing during the grant period, a hiring freeze was in operation at this time, and no "external" applicants were considered or employed by the company. A great deal of planning was given to the issue of upgrading unemployed worker skills with "real" workplace competencies. The course provided to the 60 external participants included a modified workplace literacy curriculum on communication skills, problem solving skills, and technical reading. Immediate feedback from participants was positive. Unfortunately, no process to gauge actual transfer of this training to workplace skills was developed or utilized with this population.

Objective 3: Specific model assessment tools are included in the final report. Significant outcomes are provided in the final evaluation report. Of particular note are:

- A curriculum analysis tool that was developed and distributed to teachers external to the STAT project. Copies of the curricula were studied and comments duly noted. *Relevancy, quality of organization, appropriateness of reading levels for the materials, and transferability* were criteria which the teachers utilized for evaluating curricula. (See Final Evaluation Report for forms and responses.)

- Questionnaires were provided to participants at various intervals during the project and to the supervisors at the project's end. The BCBSMo policy regarding confidentiality for workers who attended STAT classes prevented a full involvement by supervisors. However, one project outcome is that Alliance BCBS now incorporates both employee and supervisory involvement in the educational program.

- Program participants' ***Selection System**** test scores, retention and promotion rates, claims and customer service job performance ratings, productivity and customer service ratings were analyzed for significant differences as a result of training. These results provide positive project outcomes regarding STAT's impact on the individual participants and the company. (* The ***Selection System*** includes testing on the *Selection Exercises* which are tied to the unique BCBSMo workplace competencies for reading, math, writing, problem solving, and concentration/memory skills. The *Selection Exercises* (assessment tests) are given by the Personnel office to workers. Results from the *Selection Exercises* provide one criteria for the workers' ability to compete for other available jobs. Results were shared with STAT staff who then utilized results to counsel participants.)

Objective 4: Model curricula were developed, refined, reproduced, and disseminated to various organizations. These materials are available on a printing cost-recovery basis to any similar industry or educational organization that requests them. (A sample of the customized curricula may be found in **Attachment 1**.)

Objective 5: Worker involvement was encouraged through:

- One-to-one counseling that was provided to workers by project staff. This included identifying and reporting skill deficits as measured on

the company's ***Selection System*** instruments, developing individual educational plans, and providing instruction through a variety of formats.

- Feedback questionnaires and focus group sessions that were utilized to gain more information from participants. The information was then utilized to improve instruction and afford courses which were relevant and timely to the workers.

The staff development activities strengthened the professional skills of all STAT staff while building instructional team skills. Special activities were:

- Partner meetings, including a one-day planning and implementation "retreat"
- A two-day orientation for project staff, and the ABE teacher certification workshops;
- Weekly staff meetings conducted by the Project Coordinator;
- Teleconferences (on ***Learning Disabilities*** and ***Adult Numeracy***)
- Interaction with other programs and staffs e.g. Tulsa Technical College, University of Missouri- St. Louis, East Mississippi Community College, Texas Instruments Workplace Literacy project, Regional Commerce and Growth Assn. of St. Louis, AAIM Management, local labor organizations, United Way Task Force on Literacy, Gateway to Literacy, and ASTD-***Train America's Workforce*** committee and local meetings, ***National Governor's Conference-Education Policy Forum***;
- Visits made to the STAT program including Liz Miller, Program Officer from the U. S. Department of Education, and Susan Rosenblum who

conducted a field test at the STAT project for Cosmos' National Workplace Literacy Program evaluation.

- Staff attendance at a number of trainings provided by external organizations, including the Coordinator attending ***Pelavin Associates - U. S. Department of Education*** training, teachers attending the ***ICANS*** training held by North Kansas City ABE and the Northwest State's ABE programs, the Director and Coordinator attending the ***Institute for Workplace Literacy*** conducted by the Colorado Consortia, the Director's participation in ***the Missouri Literacy Technology Summit***, the Director and Coordinator's participation at the ***Literacy and Work Roundtable*** (Nashville, TN - AAACE pre-conference).

II. Once staff were employed and initial training conducted, the schedule of accomplishments followed the specified plan. Classes were on-going throughout the project period. Our evaluator assisted with establishing evaluation data collection and monitoring systems.

III. The Final Evaluation Report details characteristics of project participants and participant outcomes. Briefly, 515 worker participants and 60 external participants (ABE students) were served during the grant period. The mean age of worker participants was 35 years old with race/ethnicity being 60% white and 40% black. Approximate years of service with BCBSMo was 8-10 years, 10% average, 11-15 years, 50% average, and 16+ years, 40%. A higher percentage of female participants were served which parallel the BCBSMo demographics: 71% female to 29% male.

IV. Dissemination activities were many and varied. They include presentations at conferences, to businesses or organizations which were made by the Director or by the Director and Coordinator, convened

meetings with businesses, responses to individual requests for information, newspaper articles, and participation as a panel member for the National Center on Adult Literacy's national teleconference on workplace literacy. (See **Attachment 2** for a listing of dissemination activities).

V. Evaluation activities were central to the success of the project. Beginning early in the project, the external evaluator provided guidance for the development of the evaluation system, collection instruments, and a timeline. The formative evaluation was conducted in the early spring 1994, one year into the project. With these results we were able to adjust our training to effect needed improvements. All partners were kept "on track" regarding the project's planned objectives; all had input into how we would evaluate outcomes. The summative evaluation activities intensified during the last quarter of the project. Staff were into "file diving" (a term coined by the Project Coordinator to express the intense work which had to be done) to gather individual data on participants related to job performance. The focus group sessions that were conducted during the formative and summative periods provided input from participants after they had had an opportunity to put newly acquired skills to work and reflect for a time on what the training had meant to them. We found focus group sessions a most valuable way to measure longer-term outcomes of our training. Supervisors were candid during the focus group sessions also. They all wished that they had been involved earlier in the STAT program; still, their comments were very positive about the STAT program. (See Final Evaluation Report for company impact.)

VI. The original application had two part-time workers identified: one for counseling and a second for curriculum coordinator/master teacher-trainer. Per our request for a project revision on May 25, 1993, approval

was given to substitute one full-time position, Project Specialist. Resumes for all staff and the external evaluator were provided.

The original federal budget for the STAT project was approved for $285,125. The actual expenditures amounted to $245,236.31 in federal funds and a match amount of $116,092.87 (32%) supplied by the grantee.

St. Louis Community College wishes to gratefully acknowledge the opportunity provided by the U. S. Department of Education's National Workplace Literacy Program to develop the STAT program. Although much has been learned through this and other national workplace literacy projects, the whole field of workplace literacy is barely beyond fledgling status. It is important that successful programs show a return on investment in order to gain true "buy-in" by business, as ultimately business must pay for up-grading worker skills. And the ability for programs to track and evaluate the transfer of learning, both to workers' jobs and beyond to improved personal and family life, is the issue which drives us, as providers, to continue our work in the field. Beyond these pioneering efforts, more model programs need to be showcased. As educators, the field provides us with continuous learning opportunities. For assisting the workforce of tomorrow, these efforts cannot be underestimated as to importance or impact on the future of our economic and social health.

Attachment 1: Sample STAT Curriculum

Sample STAT Technical Reading Skills Curriculum

Exercise 16 Skills: *Drawing accurate conclusions; Using logic to interpret written material.*

Drawing Conclusions - Exercise 16

Directions: Respond "A" for correct conclusions, "B" for incorrect conclusions, or "C" for inconclusive evidence based on the facts given.

Facts: Doctor A charges less for an operation that Doctor B. Doctor B charges less than Doctor C.

Conclusions:

1. _____ Doctor C charges more than Doctor A.
2. _____ Doctor C charges more than either Doctor A or B.

Facts: Hospitals W and X charge with same amount for a given procedure. Hospital Y charges twice as much as Hospital Z. Hospital Z charges less than Hospital W.

Conclusions:

3. _____ Hospital Z charges less than Hospital X.
4. _____ Hospital Y charges twice as much as Hospital W.
5. _____ Hospitals W and X charge $500 for the procedure in question.

Sample STAT Punctuation & Grammar Skills Curriculum

WRITTEN EXPRESSION EXERCISE

Proofread the following material. Correct any errors in spelling, punctuation, grammar, and word usage.

The mission of Blue Cross and Blue Sheild of Missouri is to manage health care benifit programs, which will ensure affordable excess to quality health care.

Understanding that our business existence and continued success are dependant upon how good we meet our responsibilities to our constituencies we will continually strive to acheive a high level of client's satisfaction from all group served.

Our primary responsibility are to our customers on who we place an overriding importance because them, and them alone, allows us to exist.

We will always deal with our customers according too the highest standards of Fairness and integrity We will treat our customers with respect and dignity, and offer you only quality products at fair prices.

We will also strive to ensure that our members have affordible access to the best that medical technology and care has to offer: and act to assure that they recieve consistently high quality service.

We will always respect the dignity and privacy of our members by assuring confidentiality in regards to there medical an financial records.

We will treat our members with promptness courtesy, equality, and fairness in all our dealings with them.

Punctuation	Grammar	Usage	Spelling

Sample STAT Perception Concentration Curriculum

PERCEPTION CONCENTRATION

I. Accessing Information by Computer Code

This set of exercises requires you to pay very close attention to detail in the use of numbers and letters. These exercises will help you practice the following skills:

- Reading and following instructions
- Attending to detail
- Matching information
- Transferring information
- Increasing speed

Note: The Answer Key for all exercises is in the back of the instructional packet.

These are the directions for the first exercise. We will lead you through these directions step-by-step so that you can improve your skills in reading and following written instructions.

Exercise 1 Time: 5 minutes

In this test you are to use the code chart that appears below. The chart shows the codes used for the claim amount submitted by the customers listed in the claim column. **To find the correct code for each subscriber,** you should first look at the **name in the claim column** and then find the **identical name in the subscriber column.** Next, look at the **amount of that subscriber's claim** submitted in the claim amount column. Now find that **amount in the code chart.** Write the **corresponding code letter** in the space provided after the subscriber's name in the claims column. See the example below and study it carefully.

Claim Codes:	
$499.99 or less	L
$500-$999.99	M
$1,000-$1,499.99	A
$1,500-1,999.99	N
$2,000 or more	O
Not listed	R

	Subscriber	Claim Amount	Claim	
Example	Mabley, J. D.	$ 1,534	Mabley, J.D.	N

---

1) LOOK FOR THE KEY WORDS AND PHRASES IN THE DIRECTIONS. *Key words and phrases* contain essential information. In the above directions, the **key words and phrases** have been boldfaced.

2) LOOK FOR ANY SIGNAL WORDS. *Signal words* tell you the order of the steps needed to complete the exercise. In the above directions, the signal words have been circled.

3) Finally, ALWAYS LOOK AT THE EXAMPLE PROVIDED. The example lets you check your understanding of the directions.

***Exercise 6 Skills**: Reading and following instructions, attending to detail, matching numbers, proofreading, increasing speed.*

Exercise 6

TIME: 5 minutes for Exercises 6 - 8. Check answers at the end of Exercise 8 or the end of allotted time.

For each of the 15 items below there are three numbers that you should compare carefully. Decide if all three are alike, if only two are alike, or if none are alike. Circle the proper number in the answer column to indicate your decision as shown for item 0.

Exercise 6

			ANSWERS
0. 12579	12579	12579	0. 3 2 0
1. 1613594	1615394	1613549	1. 3 2 0
2. 87934	87934	87934	2. 3 2 0
3. 140031674	140031764	140031674	3. 3 2 0
4. 932467	932467	932647	4. 3 2 0
5. 0401793.2	040179.32	0401793.2	5. 3 2 0
6. 89005237	89005237	89005237	6. 3 2 0
7. 1.397.361.2	1.597.362.1	1.957.362.2	7. 3 2 0
8. 54921.321	54921.321	54921.211	8. 3 2 0
9. 0.2.37893	0.2.38793	0.2.38793	9. 3 2 0
10. 1378934	1387934	1397834	10. 3 2 0
11. 247.398.21	247.389.21	247.398.21	11. 3 2 0
12. 39546.234	39546.234	39546.234	12. 3 2 0
13. 79812	79182	79812	13. 3 2 0
14. 394.250.32	394.520.32	394.230.23	14. 3 2 0
15. 453042169	453402169	453402169	15. 3 2 0

***Exercise 18 Skills**: Attending to detail, locating information, transferring information, drawing conclusions.*

Exercise 18

Performance/Cash '91

SCHEDULE OF ESTIMATED PAYOUTS

If your individual performance rating is:	And you are:	And BCBSMo's weighted Service Performance is at least 90% and Financial Performance is a net pre-tax income of:	Then your Performance/Cash '91 bonus payment is estimated to be:
Consistently Surpasses Standards (CSS)	Exempt	$25 million	2% of your base salary
		$30 million	3% of your base salary
		$35 million	5% of your base salary
	Non-Exempt	$25 million	4% of your base salary
		$30 million	6% of your base salary
		$35 million	9.5% of your base salary
Consistently Meets And At Times Exceeds Standards (CMS)	Exempt	$25 million	1.5% of your base salary
		$30 million	2% of your base salary
		$35 million	3.5% of your base salary
	Non-Exempt	$25 million	3% of your base salary
		$30 million	4% of your base salary
		$35 million	6.5% of your base salary
Meets Minimum Standards (MMS)	Exempt	$25 million	.75% of your base salary
		$30 million	1% of your base salary
		$35 million	1.5% of your base salary
	Non-Exempt	$25 million	1.5% of your base salary
		$30 million	2% of your base salary
		$35 million	3% of your base salary
CSS, CMS, or MMS	Exempt or Non-Exempt	Less than $25 million	$0
CSS, CMS, or MMS	Exempt or Non-Exempt	More than $35 million	Same as with a net pre-tax income of $35 million

Please note that these are **estimated payouts** to be made in the first quarter of 1992 after the 1991 year-end results are known and reviewed by the BCBSMo Board of Trustees.

"Base salary" includes a lump-sum merit increase, if any, earned in 1991 and to be added to your salary in 1992. **Bonus payments will be subject to all federal, state and local taxes and FICA (Social Security) deductions.**

Source: Blue Cross Blue Shield of Missouri

Exercise 18 (cont'd)

1. An exempt employee whose last performance rating was MMS can expect a Performance/Cash '91 bonus payment of how much if BCBS's 1991 financial performance is a net pre-tax income of $35 million?

2. Which employee can expect the highest Performance/Cash "'91 bonus payment offered by BCBS and under what circumstances?

3. What is the dollar amount of the lowest possible net pre-tax income of the Financial Performance listed?

   What is the estimated BCBS bonus payment in the event that the net pre-tax income is less than this above-stated dollar amount?

4. Sally K. is a long-term non-exempt BCBS employee who consistently receives individual performance ratings of CMS. Her base salary is $24,500 in addition to a $2,000 merit increase she will receive in 1991. In December 1991, Sally K. inquires how much her bonus payment will be, if her merit increase will be included in her salary amount, and if her unspecified bonus will be subject to taxation.

Sample STAT Business Letter Writing Self-Study Packet

Business Letter Writing Self-Study Packet

The attached packet allows you to practice your business letter writing skills. The packet includes the following: 1) Errors Table; 2) *Tips on Writing a Business Letter*; and 3) Practice letters A - E.

Errors Table

The Errors Table on the next page lists the criteria for scoring the Writing Skills Exercise given by BCBSMo Employment and Placement. STAT will use the same criteria and scoring guide in assessing your practice letters. Two main factors are considered in the scoring process: language mechanics and expressiveness. The bold italicized text in the Errors Table indicate re-occurring problem areas that we see. Be especially careful to make your sentences and your entire letter very clear as well as to include all information given in the facts.

Tips on Writing a Business Letter

Read through these tips before beginning your practice letters. They provide definitions and explanations of the various parts of a business letter as well as good and bad examples of effective business letter writing.

Practice Letters A -E

Permit yourself *20 minutes* to read each letter and write your response. This will allow you to practice thinking and responding quickly yet accurately. As you finish each response, return your practice letter to a STAT instructor. He/she will score your letter and provide feedback. Use the feedback given in each returned letter to respond to the next letter. DO NOT DO ALL THE PRACTICE LETTERS AT ONE TIME. Practice will help you build your writing skills.

Errors Table

Factor 1: Mechanics	Examples:
1. Spelling/Word Usage (deduct 5 points for each occurrence)	1. Misspelled word; misused word (e.g., their for there, accept for except, irregardless, etc.)
2. Punctuation/Grammar (deduct 5 points for each occurrence)	2. Incorrect or missing punctuation marks; excessive use of commas; incorrect subject-verb agreement or other syntax errors.

Factor 2: Expressiveness	Examples:
1. ***Clarity: (deduct 40 points if Unacceptable; or zero points if Acceptable)***	1. Did the applicant make the response clear and easy to follow? ***Is the letter logical? (Look for unclear sentences or unclear expression of ideas.)***
2. Tone & Style: (deduct 20 points if Unacceptable; or zero points if Acceptable)	2. Did the applicant demonstrate sincere concern for the customer's problem? (Look for examples of haughtiness, or a lack of tact.) Is the letter polite and business-like? (Look for examples of sarcasm, arrogance, belittlement, or rudeness.)
3. ***Responsiveness: (deduct 40 points if Unacceptable; or zero points if Acceptable)***	*3. **Are all the customer's questions or problems answered in the letter? (Look for missing information regarding customer's questions.)*** Is the customer advised as to how the problem is or will be resolved? (Look for missing advisory statements or missing summary describing the status of the customer's problem.)

TIPS ON WRITING A BUSINESS LETTER

Greeting

- Address the person by name (use Ms. if a woman is not married or if you are uncertain of her marital status).
- Use a colon after the greeting.

Opening

- State the purpose or reason for the letter.
- If it seems appropriate, thank the person for his or her letter/inquiry.
- If you received a complaint, you might simply say that you received the letter dated — and remind the reader of the content of his or her letter.

Body

- Be sure you provide adequate information to answer the inquiry.
- Give a reasonably full explanation, providing reasons for certain costs and procedures and showing how you arrived at percents and amounts.
- Follow a clear, logical order in presenting facts; be careful not to omit any facts and give information step by step.
- Be careful not to provide more information than requested; do not overwhelm the reader with extra or irrelevant material.
- Explain any action the reader needs to take.

Conclusion

- Reinforce the purpose of the letter and/or thank the reader.
- Offer further assistance if the reader needs it.

Tone

- Always be courteous, cordial, and professional.
- Try to convey concern and willingness to help.
- Emphasize the positive and minimize the negative.
- Defuse any hostility as much as possible.

Style

- Be clear and concise as well as accurate and informative.
- Use correct grammar (subject-verb agreement; appropriate pronoun, adjective, and adverb forms) with correct spelling, punctuation, and word choice.
- Do not use contractions or slang.

LETTER A

January 18, 1994

Blue Cross Blue Shield of Missouri
1831 Chestnut
St. Louis, MO 63103

Dear Sir:

I have not been in this area for a very long time, and I have just finished my first six months of employment at Company ABC. The person in charge of benefits told me a month ago that my dependents and I were eligible at that time for health insurance coverage.

I had a surgical procedure done in a doctor's office two weeks ago, and it cost me $1,375.00. I submitted a claim to you right away. I just got a letter back saying that I am covered for only $500.00. I know you pay only 70% of all charges, but do you also limit all procedures to only $500.00? I paid the doctor, but now I only got part of it back from you. My company says I have insurance, but all you paid me was a lousy $210.00!

Sincerely,

I.M. Mad

FACTS ABOUT THIS INQUIRY

1. *The office surgery performed on Mr. Mad related to a preexisting medical condition. If the patient is insured for fewer than 12 months by us and had no previous insurance coverage - as is the case with Mr. Mad - a limit of $500.00 reimbursement per person is placed on procedures relating to preexisting conditions.*

2. *He is correct about the 70% coverage, but he is not aware that he has a deductible of $200.00. This deductible must be satisfied only once per person per calendar year.*

3. *From the $500.00 maximum eligibility for preexisting conditions, his $200.00 deductible must therefore be subtracted. This leaves $300.00. We pay 70 % of the $300.00, or $210.00. The difference between his $1,375.00 surgery bill and the $210.00 that we pay is his responsibility.*

4. *The full explanation appears on p. 15 of his benefits booklet.*

Attachment 2: Dissemination Activities

STAT Dissemination Activities

The following is a listing of dissemination activities that were provided through the STAT National Workplace Literacy program:

Presentations to the following organizations (chronological order):

University of Missouri Extension's Annual Conference

UAW Local #2250 Community Services Committee

MO's 11th Annual AFL/CIO Community Services Conference

AAACE November 1993 Conference

LIFT-MO's *"Collaborations for Success Conference"*

NCEA Region IV Community Education Conference

National Workplace Literacy Program, *Business Partners Breakfast*

United Way Labor Counselor Class

Missouri Vocational Association Annual Conference

Missouri Community College Association's Annual Conference

Webster University Student Literacy Corps Class

Illinois *Partnership for Workforce Education* Conference

League for Innovation in the Community College, *Workforce 2000*

NCAL's *What Works? Literacy Training in the Workplace Teleconference*

Technical Assistance and/or Materials (alpha order):

Alumax of South Carolina

East Mississippi Community College

Edwardsville Alternative School

Monroe Community College

Ranken Technical School

Red Cross of St. Louis

St. Mary's Hospital

Train America's Workforce Committee of ASTD's Local Chapter

Newpaper Feature Articles:

Riverfront Times, March 15, 1995

Dissemination of Report:

Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy

Dr. Larry Mikulecky, Indiana University

National Center for Adult Literacy

ERIC

LIFT-MO, Missouri State Resource Center

AAIM Management of St. Louis

Regional Commerce and Growth Association

United Way of Greater St. Louis

Literacy Service Center of St. Louis

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

STAT PROGRAM:
SKILLS TODAY FOR ADVANCEMENT TOMORROW

February13, 1995

SHARON L. SLANE, Ph.D.
EDUCATIONAL CONSULTANT

7227 COLGATE
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI 63130
(314) 727-7987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Executive Summary iii

I. Introduction and Background 1

II. Methodology 4

Formative Evaluation 4
Summative Evaluation 4

III. Results of the Formative Evaluation 7

Individual Course/Workshop Evaluation 7
Classroom Observations 14
Interviews 15
Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire 16
Focus Groups 19

IV. Results of the Summative Evaluation 22

Benefits to Individual Workers 22
Benefits to BCBSMo 27
Development of Program Models 32
Shared Perceptions of Partner Institutions 34

IV. Overview of Findings 37

Program Development 37
Impact on the Individual Worker 39
Impact on the Company 40

Appendices

A. STAT Course Catalog, Fall 1993
B. Guidelines for Formative Evaluation
C. Classroom Observation Form
D. Interview Format
E. Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire
F. Focus Group Guidelines and Discussion Form for Participants
G. Focus Group Discussion Form for Supervisors
H. Guidelines for Summative Evaluation
I. Additional Comments: Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire
J. Curriculum Analysis Forms
K. Summary: STAT Partners' Meeting

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the spring of 1993, the St. Louis Community College was awarded a National Workplace Literacy grant from the U.S. Department of Education to implement the STAT Program (Skills Today for Advancement Tomorrow). This program was a partnership for workplace education among St. Louis Community College, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri (BCBSMo), and St. Louis Public Schools Adult Basic Education (ABE) Program.

Program Overview

The primary goal of the effort was to counsel and train current BCBSMo workers with a need to upgrade and/or update their basic skills as part of the company's Selection System and related Selection Exercises. Mobility and advancement within the company are linked to successfully passing the Selection Exercises. The exercises address the three traditional skill areas of computation, reading, and writing, as well as the skills of perception, concentration, and visual memory. The STAT Program serves as the primary training support system for employees who are having difficulty passing all subtests of the exercises. The Selection Exercises are based on extensive job task analyses and measure skills needed to perform specific job functions at BCBSMo.

While the STAT Program existed at BCBSMo prior to 1993, the federal grant allowed for significant expansion of services and the development and refinement of curriculum materials. Through the grant, STAT offered the following free educational services for BCBSMo employees:

- Get ready for college courses
- Brush-up in writing, math, and other basic business skills
- Preparation for taking or re-taking the Selection Exercises
- Individual tutoring
- Take-home study packets
- Educational counseling

Classes and workshops were offered during the lunch hour, after work, and some Saturday mornings. STAT classes and workshops included the following:

- Reading Skills Brush-Up
- Math Skills Brush-Up
- Punctuation and Grammar Skills
- Business Writing Skills
- Effective Communication Skills
- Word Power
- Improve Your Memory
- Improve Your Concentration
- Problem Solving
- Study Skills and Test Anxiety

Self study packets include Business Letter-Writing Exercises, Perception/Concentration Skills, Comprehension/Problem Solving, and Memory Skills. Grant-related services have been provided to a total of (515) participants.

The grant provided support for an external evaluator to conduct formative and summative program evaluations. The purposes of the formative evaluation were to collect, analyze, and report data that would allow developers to improve the program design. In this context, major program variables were studied to determine whether or not the program was being implemented as planned, and how the program could be strengthened. The purposes of the summative evaluation were to collect, analyze, and report data on project worth. Important evaluation questions included: To what extent and in what ways do individual workers benefit from project participation? To what extent and how does BCBSMo benefit from the project? Do these benefits, if any, justify continuing the project?

Program Development

- Participant and instructor evaluations of STAT courses and workshops indicated that participants gave high ratings to the training activities and value the opportunities provided by the program. This was reinforced by classroom observations, participant responses to the evaluation questionnaires, and comments made by focus group participants.

- Classes observed were extremely well planned and well received. Objectives were clear and there was a high level of interest, participation, and attention to task on the part of participants. All instructors were well prepared, warm, friendly, and accepting.

- Focus group participants found the classes helpful in developing new skills and preparing for the Selection Exercises. Instructors were highly rated, and the fact that they were all external to BCBSMo was seen as a strength.

- Other perceived strengths of the training program include the following: flexible scheduling; small class size; voluntary attendance; availability of staff; various teaching styles; support from some managers for attending classes; support from classmates with similar needs; and individual assistance.

- Three external and two internal reviewers reviewed the STAT curriculum for relevancy of the topics, quality of organization, appropriateness of reading level, and transferability. The reviewers gave high ratings to the materials.

Impact on Individual Workers

The program benefited individual workers in several ways, including increased skills, increased scores on the Selection Exercises, and increased self-confidence.

- Participating workers showed significant increases in basic skills acquisition after completing STAT courses in reading, math, and punctuation/grammar. Based on pre-post gain scores: 95 percent improved their reading skills; 86 percent showed improvements in math skills; 81 percent improved their punctuation/grammar skills; and 85 percent showed overall increases in basic skills acquisition.

- From 64 percent to 88 percent of STAT participants improved their scores on the Selection Exercises--88 percent improved their scores on the perception/concentration section of the exercises, 80 percent improved their scores on the memory subtest, 70 percent improved their scores in numerical computation and written expression, and 64 percent improved in the area of comprehension/problem solving.

- Sixty-three percent of STAT participants who re-took one or more sections of the Selection Exercises subsequently met company standards for continued employment and eligibility to compete for promotions. Furthermore, for the subtests of perception/concentration, written expression, and comprehension/problem solving, participants who completed a related STAT course before retaking one or more sections of the test received significantly higher gain scores than those who did not.

- Ninety-two percent of participants felt that participation in the program had increased their self esteem; 60 percent indicated that it had increased their self-confidence to a great extent. This was reinforced by participant and supervisors comments.

Impact on the Company

Summative evaluation data suggest that some modest improvements in employee performance and productivity as well as increased customer satisfaction ratings may be attributable in part to program participation.

- From 1991 to 1994, the percentage of STAT participants from claims and customer service whose performance ratings improved (49%) was considerably greater than the percentage whose scores declined (20%) or stayed the same (31%).
- A considerably higher proportion of STAT participants from claims and customer service received improved productivity ratings (46%) over a four-year period as compared to those whose ratings declined (4%). Fifty percent of the ratings stayed the same from 1991 to 1994.
- Over a four-year period, 42 percent of STAT participants sampled in the customer service department received improved customer satisfaction ratings, while none received lower ratings. The ratings for 58 percent stayed the same.

According to BCBSMo administrators:

- *The project has made a difference at Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri. It has filled a need to provide academic support to non-managerial staff, and had helped to change the nature and importance of employee input into company operations--the company will conduct employee climate surveys, all-employee meetings will be held, and employee feedback groups will be instituted. By the end of April 1995, every employee will have a development plan.*
- *Employees need developmental support, want it, and STAT has played an important role. This support needs to be provided into 1995 and beyond. It may become a more internal process in the future.*

Finally, the program has been institutionalized. Starting in January of 1995, STAT workshops will be offered on company time. The program has been restructured from a classroom instruction model to a more individualized, self-paced, computer-assisted approach provided in a multi-station basic skills lab. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri purchased all of the hardware for the lab and some of the software, and the grant supported the costs of additional basic skills software. The system is now being accessed by other Blue Cross and Blue Shield offices in Missouri.

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In the spring of 1993, the St. Louis Community College was awarded a National Workplace Literacy grant from the U.S. Department of Education to implement the STAT Program (Skills Today for Advancement Tomorrow). This program was a partnership for workplace education among St. Louis Community College, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri (BCBSMo), and St. Louis Public Schools Adult Basic Education (ABE) Program.

The primary goal of the effort was to counsel and train current BCBSMo workers with a need to upgrade and/or update their basic skills as part of the company's Selection System and related Selection Exercises. Mobility and advancement within the company are linked to successfully passing the Selection Exercises. The exercises address the three traditional skill areas of computation, reading, and writing, as well as the skills of perception, concentration, and visual memory. The STAT Program serves as the primary training support system for employees who are having difficulty passing all subtests of the exercises. The Selection Exercises are based on extensive job task analyses and measure skills needed to perform specific job functions at BCBSMo. The Human Resources Department sets related policies and administers the Selection Exercises.

While the STAT Program existed at BCBSMo prior to 1993, the federal grant allowed for significant expansion of services and the development and refinement of curriculum materials. Through the grant, STAT offered the following free educational services for BCBSMo employees:

- Get ready for college courses
- Brush-up in writing, math, and other basic business skills
- Preparation for taking or re-taking the Selection Exercises
- Individual tutoring
- Take-home study packets
- Educational counseling

Classes and workshops were offered during the lunch hour, after work, and some Saturday mornings. STAT classes and workshops included the following:

- Reading Skills Brush-Up
- Math Skills Brush-Up
- Punctuation and Grammar Skills
- Business Writing Skills
- Effective Communication Skills
- Word Power
- Improve Your Memory
- Improve Your Concentration
- Problem Solving
- Study Skills and Test Anxiety

Self study packets include Business Letter-Writing Exercises, Perception/Concentration Skills, Comprehension/Problem Solving, and Memory Skills. A STAT Course Catalog for the fall of 1993 is included as Appendix A. and illustrates the typical course offerings.

Grant-related services have been provided 6,848 hours of instruction to a total of (515) participants. A breakout of participants by sex, race, age, years with the company, and hours in the program is provided in Table 1.

The grant provided support for an external evaluator to conduct formative and summative program evaluations. An Interim Evaluation Report, summarizing formative evaluation activities and results, was submitted on May 12, 1994. This Final Evaluation Report summarizes the findings of the interim evaluation and presents the results of the summative evaluation.

Section II of the report, Methodology, describes the formative and summative evaluation designs and related data collection strategies. Sections III and IV summarize the formative and summative evaluation results. Section V provides an overview of the findings.

Table 1
STAT Participants by Sex, Race, Age, Years
With the Company, and Hours in the Program

	Frequency	%*
Sex		
Female	448	87%
Male	67	13%
Race		
White	262	51%
African-American	241	47%
Hispanic	4	1%
Asian	2	.5%
Native American	2	.5%
Unknown	4	1%
Age		
55+	21	4%
45-54	103	20%
35-44	210	41%
25-34	171	33%
15-24	5	1%
Years With the Company		
1-4	104	20%
5-9	149	29%
10-14	73	14%
15-19	81	16%
20-24	74	15%
25-29	23	5%
30+	6	1%
Hours in the Program		
1-5	178	35%
6-9	80	16%
10-14	89	17%
15-19	49	10%
20-24	34	7%
25-29	25	5%
30-34	21	4%
35-39	14	3%
40+	25	5%

*Percentages in each category will not always add up to 100% due to rounding.

II. METHODOLOGY

Formative Evaluation

The purposes of the formative evaluation were to collect, analyze, and report data that would allow developers to improve the program design. In this context, major program variables were studied to determine whether or not the program was being implemented as planned, and how the program could be strengthened. Program variables, formative evaluation questions, and formative assessment strategies are summarized in "Guidelines for Formative Evaluation," included as Appendix B. These guidelines were developed by the external evaluator, in consultation with and with the approval of, all members of the partnership.

Data collection included:

- Individual participant and instructor evaluations of each course and workshop
- Observations of selected training activities
- Interviews of selected BCBSMo administrators
- Participant and supervisor responses to an interim project evaluation questionnaire
- Focus groups with selected participants
- Focus group with selected supervisors

The following data collection instruments and formats are appended:

- Appendix C. Classroom Observation Form
- Appendix D. Interview Format
- Appendix E. Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire
- Appendix F. Focus Group Guidelines and Discussion Form for Participants
- Appendix G. Focus Group Discussion Form for Supervisors

Summative Evaluation

The purposes of the summative evaluation were to collect, analyze, and report data on project worth. Important evaluation questions included: To what extent and in what ways do

individual workers benefit from project participation? To what extent and how does BCBSMo benefit from the project? Do these benefits, if any, justify continuing the project?

The summative evaluation design addressed each of the project's stated goals and performance objectives.[1] Specific evaluation questions included the following:

- To what extent do individual workers benefit from participating in the STAT project?
- To what extent does BCBSMo benefit from involving their workers in the STAT project?
- To what extent do prospective workers benefit from participating in the STAT project?
- To what extent does BCBSMo benefit from providing STAT services to prospective workers?
- To what extent do the project's assessment and evaluation systems provide new measurement tools for the health care benefits industry?
- To what extent are the project's curriculum materials valid, competency based, and transferable to similar settings?
- To what extent are the workers involved in all aspects of the STAT project's development?
- To what extent are project evaluation strategies designed jointly by STAT partners and the project evaluator?
- To what extent is the program continued at the conclusion of the initial project period?

Data collection included:

- Pre-post gains on the Reading Brush-Up, Math Brush-Up, and Punctuation and Grammar tests;
- Pre-post scores on the BCBSMo Selection Exercises (five subtests and an overall average score);

[1] Evaluation activities related to goals 2 and 5 were eliminated. The purpose of goal 2 was to develop a recruitment and training referral system wherein prospective workers would be trained to successfully compete for jobs at BCBSMo. Because of a reorganization and hiring freeze, there was no longer a need for a pool of potential workers. Goal 5, to involve workers in all aspects of STATs program development, was not implemented due to confidentiality issues.

- Supervisor performance appraisals for each of four years for a sample of participants working in the claims and customer service departments;

- Job retention, attendance, punctuality, productivity, and quality of work (error rate and customer satisfaction) ratings, collected over a period of four years, for a sample of participants working in the claims and customer service departments; and

- Perceptions of all members of the partnership with regard to program strengths, weaknesses, and future plans.

Project goals, performance objectives, evaluation questions, evaluation criteria, and assessment strategies are summarized in "Guidelines for Summative Evaluation," included as Appendix H. These guidelines were developed by the external evaluator, in consultation with all members of the partnership.

III. RESULTS OF THE FORMATIVE EVALUATION

Results of the following assessment components are presented and discussed in this section of the report:

- Individual Course/Workshop Evaluations
- Classroom Observations
- Interviews
- Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire
- Focus Groups

Individual Course/Workshop Evaluations

Participant evaluation forms were completed for most of the STAT courses and workshops. Completed forms were reviewed by program staff at the end of each training event, and results were used to refine training schedules, presentation strategies, and materials. In general, participants gave the courses and workshops very high ratings and have valued the opportunities provided by the program. Results of a course-by-course analysis, for each of six evaluation questions, is presented in Tables 2 through 7.

Table 2
STAT Course/Workshop Evaluations

To what extent was the session instructive and useful?

Not Helpful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Very Helpful*

Course/Workshop	N	Range of Responses	Mean
Perception/Concentration	55	4-7	6.10
Punctuation & Grammar	44	4-7	6.48
Math	60	5-7	6.77
Communication	56	5-7	6.54
Memory	36	5-7	6.69
Power Reading	25	5-7	6.64
Drawing Conclusions	35	4-7	5.89
Word Power	53	5-7	6.72
Study Skills	21	4-7	6.14
Business Writing	18	4-7	6.11

Table 3
STAT Course/Workshop Evaluations

How was the pace of the workshop (i.e., the information covered compared to the time spent covering it)?

Too Slow 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 *Too Fast*

Course/Workshop	N	Range of Responses	Mean
Perception/Concentration	55	3-7	4.80
Punctuation & Grammar	43	4-7	5.05
Math	57	3-7	5.44
Communication	61	4-7	5.87
Memory	38	4-6	4.76
Power Reading	25	4-6	4.60
Drawing Conclusions	35	4-7	5.19
Word Power	53	4-7	5.12
Study Skills	20	4-6	4.80
Business Writing	18	3-7	5.22

Table 4
STAT Course/Workshop Evaluations

Please evaluate the instructor(s) on their knowledge of the subject.

Poor *Excellent*
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Course/Workshop	N	Range of Responses	Mean
Perception/Concentration	55	4-7	6.49
Punctuation & Grammar	44	5-7	6.80
Math	60	4-7	6.78
Communication	61	5-7	6.62
Memory	39	6-7	6.85
Power Reading	25	6-7	6.76
Drawing Conclusions	35	4-7	5.63
Word Power	53	5-7	6.83
Study Skills	21	4-7	6.57
Business Writing	18	5-7	6.28

Table 5
STAT Course/Workshop Evaluations

Please evaluate the instructor(s) on their presentation skills.

Poor *Excellent*
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Course/Workshop	N	Range of Responses	Mean
Perception/Concentration	55	4-7	6.67
Punctuation & Grammar	44	6-7	6.75
Math	60	4-7	6.70
Communication	62	5-7	6.52
Memory	39	6-7	6.85
Power Reading	25	6-7	6.80
Drawing Conclusions	35	3-7	6.09
Word Power	53	5-7	6.79
Study Skills	21	5-7	6.71
Business Writing	17	5-7	6.30

Table 6
STAT Course/Workshop Evaluations

Please evaluate the instructor(s) on their response to questions.

Poor *Excellent*
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Course/Workshop	N	Range of Responses	Mean
Perception/Concentration	55	4-7	6.67
Punctuation & Grammar	44	6-7	6.86
Math	60	4-7	6.78
Communication	63	5-7	6.52
Memory	39	6-7	6.85
Power Reading	24	6-7	6.92
Drawing Conclusions	35	4-7	5.63
Word Power	53	6-7	6.91
Study Skills	21	5-7	6.71
Business Writing	18	6-7	6.56

Table 7
STAT Course/Workshop Evaluations

Would you recommend this or a similar course to your co-workers? *Yes* *No*

Course/Workshop	N	% Responding "Yes"
Perception/Concentration	55	89%
Punctuation & Grammar	44	89%
Math	60	97%
Communication	64	91%
Memory	39	80%
Power Reading	25	84%
Drawing Conclusions	35	91%
Word Power	53	94%
Study Skills	21	95%
Business Writing	18	94%

Classroom Observations

Three different courses and one workshop were each observed for a brief period of 15 to 30 minutes. Originally, the evaluator planned to spend much more time observing training activities. This strategy was dropped after the initial four observations because it became obvious that the sessions were extremely well planned, and extremely well received by participants.

The four training activities observed were:

- Math Skills Brush Up (Section 1)
- Math Skills Brush Up (Section 2)
- Punctuation & Grammar
- Improving Your Memory

A copy of the Classroom Observation Form is included as Appendix C. Results of the observations are summarized below.

Clarity of Objectives. In two of the sessions observed, the evaluator was present at the beginning of the session. In both cases, the instructor clearly stated the objectives of the sessions and what he or she hoped to accomplish during the class period. In the other two sessions, the evaluator arrived while the classes were already in progress. Objectives of each of these training sessions also seemed to be clear, given that participants were following along without any apparent confusion.

Level of Interest, Participation, and Attention to Task. Levels of interest, participation, and attention to task were high in all classes observed. This is not surprising in a voluntary program, particularly when the instructors are very effective.

Quality of Teaching Methods and Instructional Materials. Four different instructors were observed. The two math instructors used somewhat different teaching styles. One used a direct presentational approach. The other used a more informal, group problem-solving approach. Students in the latter group were placed in the class because of a high level of math anxiety. All instructors were well prepared, warm,

friendly, accepting, and apparently helpful. The instructional materials were not examined closely but appeared to be clear and well organized.

Interviews

Three BCBSMo administrators were interviewed, two of whom are directly involved in the administration of the STAT Program. The purpose of these interviews was to get a very general reading of BCBSMo's perceptions of program impact on the company and needs for improvement. Comments are summarized below.

1. The addition of workplace literacy resources provided to the program through the federal grant and related three-way partnership has benefited the company and participants in a variety of ways:

    - The scope of the program was increased.
    - Additional resources and expertise were applied to the program, thereby reducing pressure on BCBSMo staff.
    - Additional community resources were identified and focused on the program.

2. Benefits to participants have included the following:

    - The program has had a tremendous confidence-building effect. Some participants were actually talking about going to college. Once they were on a "learning track," they wanted to stay on it.
    - Participants have developed confidence and are learning how to learn. This has in turn helped morale and productivity, and ultimately is in the best interest of the company.

3. Overall strengths of the training program include the following:

    - The fact that instructors were professional educators external to the company made participating workers feel more comfortable. "You don't feel stupid when it's a teacher."
    - Instructors have been extremely sensitive to workers' needs and concerns.
    - The volunteer nature of the program has worked well.

- There has been a tremendously positive reaction from employees.

4. BCBSMo administrators expressed some disappointment that the external component had not worked as planned. They explained that the employment needs of the company changed over the last few years, and an external pool of qualified applicants was less critical than it had been previously.

5. At the end of the grant period, the program will be restructured from a classroom approach to individualized, self-paced, computer-assisted instruction provided in a skills center.

Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire

In mid-February, 334 current and past STAT participants and 55 BCBSMo supervisors were asked to complete brief questionnaires regarding their experiences with STAT Program services. Completed forms were received from 79 participants and 12 supervisors. Participant and supervisor responses are summarized in Tables 8 and 9. Additional suggestions and comments are included as Appendix I.

Table 8
Participant Responses: Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire

		N*	Mean*	SD
Question 1:	To what extent are STAT's goals and objectives clear?	77	4.09	.80
Question 2:	To what extent is STAT well organized?	77	4.16	.73
Question 3:	To what extent are recruitment strategies effective?	71	3.77	.93
Question 4:	To what extent do training activities meet real needs?	76	3.88	.82
Question 5:	To what extent are instructors, instructional methods, and materials of high quality?	75	4.21	.81
Question 6:	To what extent are training activities scheduled at convenient times?	76	3.54	1.06
Question 7:	To what extent are training activities successful in improving workplace literacy skills?	73	4.11	.72
Question 8:	To what extent are STAT support services, such as the Skills Center, self-study exercises, etc., helpful to participants?	74	4.23	.63
Question 9:	To what extent have you taken advantage of these services?	76	3.72	.92
Question 10:	To what extent have you found these services helpful?	74	4.19	.73
Question 11:	To what extent has your participation in STAT increased your self confidence?	75	3.80	.99
Question 12:	To what extent has your participation in STAT helped you to become a better worker?	75	3.68	1.04

* Scored on a five-point scale: 5 = To a Great Extent; 1 = Not at All.

Table 9
Supervisor Responses: Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire

		N*	Mean**	SD
Question 1:	To what extent are you aware of the STAT project?	12	3.67	1.07
Question 2:	To what extent are STAT's goals and objectives clear?	12	3.67	.89
Question 3:	To what extent is STAT well organized?	11	3.55	.52
Question 4:	To what extent do STAT staff seem to be well qualified?	10	4.00	.82
Question 5:	To what extent are recruitment strategies reaching the BCBSMo workers for whom they are intended?	10	3.20	.79
Question 6:	To what extent are training activities successful in improving workplace literacy skills?	9	3.55	.73
Question 7:	To what extent are other STAT support services, such as the Skills Center, self-study exercises, etc., by STAT helpful to participants?	9	4.11	.60

* Of the 12 respondents, not every supervisor answered every question.

** Scored on a five-point scale: 5 = To a Great Extent; 1 = Not at All.

Focus Groups

Three focus groups were facilitated by the external evaluator--two with groups of STAT participants and one with supervisors.

Focus Group With STAT Participants

Focus group participants were selected randomly. Of the 369 individuals the program has served through the federal grant to date, 20 names were randomly pulled from the files. These individuals were contacted and asked to attend one of two focus groups. Of the 20 individuals contacted, 12 were able to attend one of the groups.

The first focus group, held April 18 at the Chestnut location, was attended by six workers. These individuals had participated in from two to eight STAT courses or workshops. Participants' comments and suggestions are summarized below.

Strengths/Benefits

- New skills gained from the Punctuation/Grammar and Writing courses
- Changed perceptions of ability
- Preparation for selection exercises
- Improved scores on the Selection Exercises
- Class schedule--flexible scheduling, classes during the lunch hour and after work
- Voluntary nature of the program
- Availability of staff
- Instructors external to BCBSMo--it is easier to be honest with them
- Instructors are non-judgmental, trained to listen, seemed to care more
- Instructors help workers examine options
- Various teachers with different teaching styles
- Small class size
- 1:1 assistance
- Support from classmates with similar problems/needs
- Some managers encourage workers to attend classes
- Short-term training; not locked in forever
- Option to take classes many times
- No cost

Weaknesses/Recommendations

- Focus of learning is on the test rather than the skills
- Intimidation of the testing situation
- Need more test-taking practice
- Information on program wasn't readily available, particularly at City Center

The second focus group, held at One City Center on April 21, was also attended by six workers. Their experience with the program ranged from two to eight courses or workshops. All had taken part in at least one home study exercise. Participant comments and suggestions follow.

Strengths/Benefits

- Keeping the job
- Promotion potential
- Preparation for the Selection Exercises
- Probably helps with on-the-job skills, but not as obvious
- Refreshed skills, personal and on-the-job
- Instructors made you feel comfortable
- Instructors were sensitive and perceptive
- Availability of instructors
- 1:1 training
- The home study option allows for individualized pacing and 1:1 assistance later
- Lunch hour classes*
- Some supervisors encourage attendance

Weaknesses/Recommendations

- Lunch hour classes*
- Not enough time in classes for discussion or help
- Going to after-work classes at another site
- Resistance from some supervisors
- Last year's materials were weak and had numerous mistakes
- Some of the STAT mailings weren't received at all or weren't received in time to respond
- Some courses/workshops by themselves aren't that helpful in building skills because more individual practice is needed
- Need a class on office etiquette for everyone

* One participant felt that lunch hour classes were a strength of the program; another felt this was a weakness.

Focus Group With Supervisors

A focus group for supervisors was held at the Chestnut location on October 12, 1994, from 8:30 to 9:30. Eleven supervisors attended the session. These supervisors were randomly selected from all supervisors across the company. Participating supervisors were asked to respond to six discussion questions. These questions, along with supervisor responses, are summarized on the next page.

1. How familiar are you with the STAT Program?

Of the 11 participants, two reported being very familiar with STAT; the remaining nine said they were at least somewhat familiar with the program.

2. Have any of your employees participated in STAT?

Nine of the participants knew for sure that employees under their supervision had participated in STAT; one said she didn't supervise any STAT participants, and the remaining supervisor said she didn't know whether or not any of her employees had participated in the program.

3. In what ways do you think employees have benefited from the STAT Program?

- Job retention
- Promotion
- Increased motivation to pursue further education, sometimes even college
- Increased skills
- Increased self-confidence

4. To what extent has STAT met your needs as a supervisor?

Supervisors felt that the program was not really meeting their needs because they were not in the information loop. They expressed a desire to know more about the program, including which of their employees were involved and how these individuals were benefiting from participation.

5. What are some of the greatest strengths of the program?

- Training of employees
- Building confidence
- Flexibility in meeting individual needs
- Voluntary nature of the program
- Home study option

6. In what ways could the program be improved? (and other suggestions)

- Include supervisors/managers in the information loop
- Provide supervisors/managers with feedback on program progress
- Provide managers with an overview of skills taught
- Include an overview of STAT as part of the orientation for new employees
- Market the program as a vehicle for personal/career development rather than remediation
- Change the project name to remove the association with remediation
- Separate professional development from selection exercises
- Provide incentives for participation
- Advertise program and individual accomplishments--accomplishment board, testimonials from participants, newsletter
- Provide a second level of skills upgrades for employees above the clerical level
- Reach production workers
- Videotape classes for home study use
- Continue the use of practice tests
- Provide classes in sales, communication, time management, organizational skills
- Have brown bag lunches

IV. RESULTS OF THE SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

Information on project worth is reported in the following four sections of this report:

- Benefits to Individual Workers
- Benefits to BCBSMo
- Development of Program Models
- Shared Perceptions of Partner Institutions

Benefits to Individual Workers

Development of Basic Skills

Well over 70 percent of participants showed an increase in basic skills acquisition after taking courses in reading, math, and punctuation/grammar. Based on their pre-post gain scores: 95 percent improved in the area of reading; 86 percent improved in the area of math; 81 percent improved in punctuation/grammar; and 85 percent showing an overall increase across the three content areas. Mean pre- and post-test scores in each area are shown in Table 9.

Table 9
Mean Pre- and Post-test Scores in Reading, Math, and Punctuation/Grammar*

Content Area	N	Mean Pre-test Score	Mean Post-test Score
Reading	40	13.60	17.88
Math	86	12.50	18.34
Punctuation/ Grammar	89	38.79	43.91

*Number possible: reading = 22; math = 30; punctuation/grammar = 55.

Overall Improvement of Scores on the Selection Exercises

As illustrated in Table 10, a high percentage of STAT participants improved their scores on the Selection Exercises. Eighty-eight percent (88%) who re-took the perception/concentration section of the exercises improved their scores, 80 percent improved their scores on the memory subtest, 70 percent improved their scores in numerical computation and written expression, and 64 percent improved in the area of comprehension/problem solving.

Table 10
Percent of STAT Participants Who Improved Their Scores on the Selection Exercises

Subtest	Number Re-taking the Subtest	Number Improving Their Scores	Percent Improving Their Scores
Perception/ Concentration	130	114	88%
Memory	74	59	80%
Numerical Computation	111	78	70%
Written Expression	79	55	70%
Comprehension/ Problem Solving	89	57	64%

Eligibility to Compete for Promotions

While the projected 70 percent criterion was not reached, 63 percent of STAT participants who re-took one or more sections of the Selection Exercises subsequently met company standards for continued employment (passing scores on each subtest and the overall score) and eligibility to compete for promotions. Furthermore, for the subtests of perception/concentration, written expression, and comprehension/problem solving, participants who completed a related STAT course before retaking one or more sections of the test received significantly higher gain scores than those who did not (see Table 11).

Table 11
Mean Gain Scores on Selection Exercises for Individuals Who Completed a Relevant STAT Course/Workshop vs. Those Who Did Not

Courses/Workshops	N	Mean Gain Score*	Standard Deviation
Perception/ Concentration			
Completed a STAT course	94	2.17**	1.35
Did not complete a STAT course	37	1.54**	1.35
Memory			
Completed a STAT course	38	1.97	1.68
Did not complete a STAT course	36	2.33	1.88
Numerical Computation			
Completed a STAT course	93	1.54	1.44
Did not complete a STAT course	17	.88	1.11
Written Expression			
Completed a STAT course	66	1.45**	1.37
Did not complete a STAT course	13	.38**	1.26

* Scored on a six-point scale: 6 = Superior; 1 = Unsatisfactory.

**$p < .02$

Table 11, continued
Mean Gain Scores on Selection Exercises for Individuals Who Completed a Relevant STAT Course/Workshop vs. Those Who Did Not

Courses/Workshops	N	Mean*	Standard Deviation
Comprehension/ Problem Solving			
Completed a STAT course	64	1.25**	1.45
Did not complete a STAT course	25	.42**	1.25
Overall Score (mean for all five subtests)			
Completed a STAT course	131	.62	.69
Did not complete a STAT course	98	.75	.68

* Scored on a six-point scale: 6 = Superior; 1 = Unsatisfactory.

**$p < .02$

Job Retention

A job retention study of 105 employees in BCBSMo's customer service and claims departments was designed and conducted by program staff. Results for each department are presented in Tables 12 and 13.

Table 12
Job Retention Data for Individuals Who Participated in STAT
vs. Those Who Did Not: Customer Service Department*

	STAT (1 or more hours)	No STAT	Total Number
Kept Job	19	9	28
Lost Job	4	9	13
Total	23	18	41

*Note: In December of 1993, the Customer Service Department (41 employees) needed to downsize due to reorganization. Thirteen service representative positions were marked for elimination. Customer Service management and the Human Resources Department used the following criteria to determine which 13 employees would be downsized: 1992-93 performance review ratings; formalized counselings (for problems on the job); Selection Exercise scores; Writing Skills Exercise scores; and attendance.

Table 13
Job Retention Data for Individuals Who Participated in STAT
vs. Those Who Did Not: Claims Department*

	STAT (1 or more hours)	No STAT	Total Number
Kept Job	21	27	48
Lost Job	8	8	16
Total	29	35	64

*Note: In December 1993, the Claims Department needed to downsize its professional evaluator staff (64) by 16 positions. Of these 16 employees, four were terminated and twelve were placed in lower level positions in a different department. Criteria for determining which 16 employees would be downsized included the following: 1992-93 performance review ratings; formalized counselings (for problems on the job); Selection Exercise scores; and attendance.

It appears that STAT participation may have been a factor in job retention in the Customer Service Department, however, many other variables were also taken into account as indicated in the Note following Table 12.

Self-confidence and Empowerment

Participant responses to question #11 of the Interim Evaluation Questionnaire indicate that 92 percent of participants felt that participation in the program had increased their self-confidence; 60 percent indicated that it had increased their self-confidence to a great extent. This was reinforced by participant and supervisors comments in the focus groups conducted as part of the formative evaluation.

Benefits to BCBSMo

Performance Appraisals

Table 14 illustrates mean supervisor performance ratings over a four-year period for a sample of STAT participants. The sample represents BCBSMo's customer service and claims departments. While the means increase over the four-year period, the increases are small and can't necessarily be attributed to STAT participation. The performance ratings were assigned by supervisors during annual performance reviews of all company employees. The ratings are highly subjective, and in any four-year period for a single employee, performance may have been rated by as many as four different supervisors.

Table 15 shows the percentage of STAT participants whose performance appraisals showed improvement, stayed the same, or declined over this same four-year period and over the last year. For the four-year comparison ranging from 1991 to 1994, the percentage of STAT participants whose performance ratings improved was considerably greater than the percentage whose ratings declined. This did not, however, reach the 70 percent level as hoped.

Table 14
Mean Supervisor Performance Ratings for a Sample of
STAT Participants Over a Four-year Period

Year of Rating	N*	Mean**	Standard Deviation
1990-1991	55	2.91	.67
1991-1992	68	3.03	.65
1992-1993	69	3.22	.59
1993-1994	67	3.21	.57

* Numbers represent STAT participants who held the relevant position during the year of rating.

** Four-point rating scale: 4=consistently surpasses standards; 3=consistently meets standards; 2=usually meets standards; and 1=does not meet standards.

Table 15
Percentage of a Sample of STAT Participants Whose Performance Appraisals Showed
Improvement, Stayed the Same, or Declined Over a Four-year Period

Years	N	% Improved	% Stayed Same	% Declined
1991-1994	49	49%	31%	20%

Productivity

Productivity Ratings

Table 16 illustrates mean productivity ratings for STAT participants sampled from the customer service and claims departments. The ratings are determined by supervisors and pertain to the number of customers or claims handled. According to program staff, supervisors cautioned them not to give too much credence to these ratings because the standards often change for year to year, and reorganization may result in fewer customer service reps taking more calls. However, as illustrated in Table 17, a considerably higher proportion of STAT participants in the sample received improved productivity ratings (46%) as

compared to those whose ratings declined (4%) over the four-year comparison period. The same holds for the one-year comparison.

Table 16
Mean Productivity Ratings for a Sample of
STAT Participants Over a Four-year Period

Year of Rating	N*	Mean**	Standard Deviation
1990-1991	55	2.96	.84
1991-1992	67	3.12	.73
1992-1993	65	3.09	.74
1993-1994	66	3.33	.71

* Numbers represent STAT participants who held the relevant position during the year of rating.

** Four-point rating scale: 4=consistently surpasses standards; 3=consistently meets standards; 2=usually meets standards; and 1=does not meet standards.

Table 17
Percentage of a Sample of STAT Participants Whose Productivity Ratings Showed Improvement, Stayed the Same, or Declined Over a Four-year Period

Years	N	% Improved	% Stayed Same	% Declined
1991-1994	48	46%	50%	4%

Attendance

Attendance data for the sample of STAT participants is shown in Tables 18 and 19. The data are inconclusive as to what relationship program participation had on attendance. An experimental-control comparison would be more useful in examining this relationship.

Table 18
Mean Attendance Figures for a Sample of
STAT Participants Over a Four-year Period

Year of Rating	N*	Mean# of Days Absent	Standard Deviation
1990-1991	50	3.06	.27
1991-1992	57	4.25	.90
1992-1993	64	4.20	.83
1993-1994	61	3.20	.45

* Numbers represent STAT participants who held the relevant position during the year of rating.

Table 19
Percentage of a Sample of STAT Participants Whose Attendance Showed
Improvement, Stayed the Same, or Declined Over a Four-year Period

Years	N	% Improved	% Stayed Same	% Declined
1991-1994	41	44%	22%	34%

Punctuality

Punctuality ratings are shown in Tables 20 and 21. Like the attendance date, little useful information can be gained regarding the program's impact on punctuality.

Table 20
Mean Punctuality Figures for a Sample of
STAT Participants Over a Four-year Period

Year of Rating	N	Mean**	Standard Deviation
1990-1991	55	2.47	.50
1991-1992	68	2.43	.55
1992-1993	69	2.23	.46
1993-1994	65	2.38	.55

* Numbers represent STAT participants who held the relevant position during the year of rating.

** Three-point rating scale: 3=particular strength; 2=no comment necessary; 1=needs improvement.

Table 21
Percentage of a Sample of STAT Participants Whose Punctuality Showed
Improvement, Stayed the Same, or Declined Over a Four-year Period

Years	N	% Improved	% Stayed Same	% Declined
1991-1994	47	11%	60%	30%

Quality of Work

Quality ratings of employees' work were also collected for a sample of STAT employees in the customer service and claims departments. For the claims department, qualitative ratings were based on error rate. In customer service, ratings were based on customer satisfaction. Table 22 illustrates mean qualitative ratings over a four-year period. The differences are too small to warrant any conclusions about program effects. However, as shown in Table 23, over a four-year period from 1991-1994, 42 percent of STAT participants sampled in the customer service department received improved customer satisfaction ratings, while none received lower ratings.

Table 22
Mean Qualitative Ratings for a Sample of
STAT Participants Over a Four-year Period

Year of Rating	N*	Mean**	Standard Deviation
1990-1991	54	2.93	.75
1991-1992	65	2.97	.73
1992-1993	68	3.26	.66
1993-1994	65	3.22	.54

* Numbers represent STAT participants who held the relevant position during the year of rating.

** Four-point rating scale: 4 = Consistently Surpasses Standards; 1 = Does Not Meet Standards.

Table 23
Percentage of a Sample of STAT Participants in Customer Service Whose
Customer Satisfaction Ratings Showed Improvement, Stayed the Same,
or Declined Over a Four-year Period

Years	N	% Improved	% Stayed Same	% Declined
1991-1994	19	42%	58%	0%

Development of Program Models

Assessment and Evaluation Systems

A formal, external analysis of program assessment and evaluation systems was not conducted as planned because the evaluation system is still in a developmental stage.

Competency-based Curriculum

Three external reviewers and two internal reviewers were asked to review the following curriculum packets: Perception/Concentration; Comprehension/Problem Solving; Memory Skills; Math; and Writing. Each packet was reviewed for relevancy of the topic, quality of

organization, appropriateness of reading level, and transferability. Copies of the curriculum analysis forms are included as Appendix J. The results of these analyses is summarized in Table 24. In general, the reviewers gave high ratings to the materials.

Table 24
Results of Curriculum Analysis for Perception/Concentration, Comprehension/Problem Solving, Memory Skills, Math, and Writing

Curriculum Area/Rating Category	Mean Rating*	Number of Reviewers
Perception/Concentration		3 external reviewers
Relevancy of Topic	4.33	
Organization	4.56	
Reading Level	4.56	
Transferability	4.22	
Comprehension/Problem Solving		3 external reviewers
Relevancy of Topic	4.50	
Organization	4.33	
Reading Level	5.00	
Transferability	4.25	
Memory Skills		3 external reviewers
Relevancy of Topic	4.67	
Organization	4.50	
Reading Level	4.33	
Transferability	3.50	
Math		1 internal reviewer
Relevancy of Topic	4.00	
Organization	4.00	
Reading Level	4.00	
Transferability	4.00	
Writing		1 internal reviewer
Relevancy of Topic	4.00	
Organization	4.29	
Reading Level	4.00	
Transferability	4.14	

* Scored on a five-point scale: 5 = High; 1 = Low.

Shared Perceptions

A meeting of representatives of all three STAT partners was held on December 6, 1994. A copy of the meeting agenda and meeting summary are included as Appendix K. Four major topics covered were: review of project outcomes; shared perceptions of the project by each partner; future partnership activities and collaboration; and dissemination.

Following a brief overview of the evaluation findings to date provided by the external evaluator, partners discussed their perceptions of what worked, what didn't work, and what they would do differently. The following comments and suggestions were generated[1]:

- *The project has made a difference at Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri. It has filled a need to provide academic support to non-managerial staff, and had helped to change the nature and importance of employee input into company operations--the company will conduct employee climate surveys, all-employee meetings will be held, and employee feedback groups will be instituted. By the end of April 1995, every employee will have a development plan.* (BCBS)[2]

- *Some things have worked marvelously well, some things haven't worked as well. If we had a chance, we'd do it again. Could we have done more? Probably, but we didn't.* (BCBS)

- *The project was key to helping employees get through a period of reorganization and downsizing, and it gave them something they could do about their situations.* (BCBS)

- *Employees need developmental support, want it, and STAT has played an important role. This support needs to be provided into 1995 and beyond. It may become a more internal process in the future.* (BCBS)

- *The program has been restructured from a classroom instruction model to a more individualized, self-paced, computer assisted approach provided in a skills center. In addition, starting in January of 1995, STAT workshops will be offered on company time.* (BCBS)

- *A strength of the project from the perspective of the educational providers was that it was already in place in the company, and additional job audits weren't required.* (SLCC)[3]

- *Targeting services and focusing on a single department* [at a time], *rather than trying to serve everyone* [at the same time], *might have been more likely to lead to measurable impact. However, the company had a need to provide services company wide.* (SLCC)

---

1 These comments and suggestions are exact or nearly exact quotes from meeting participants.

2 BCBS--Alliance Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri

3 St. Louis Community College

- *Next time we might narrow our expectations.* (SLCC)

- *While peer involvement in project planning was built into the proposal, it didn't work because the culture wasn't right. The educational provider needs to be flexible enough to respond to the business culture.* (SLCC)

- *It was hoped that the curriculum could be computerized before the end of the project, but that didn't happen.* (SLCC)

- *The project would have benefited from much more interface and integration with managers and supervisors.* (SLCC)

- *The external component, designed to train potential workers, didn't get off the ground for a number of reasons, including a reorganization and hiring freeze at Blue Cross and Blue Shield that wasn't anticipated when the grant was initially submitted. Other problems encountered may have been related to Missouri's ABE structure. If this component had been implemented, it could have had some positive spin-offs, including benefits to the community.* (ABE)[4]

- [From the perspective of the ABE Program Director] *the project was another opportunity to broaden the horizons of some clients, but not directly related to employability in the community. It is difficult to related general training materials to employability. Clients want something that is tied to getting a job* [a concrete intervention and a definite connection to actual jobs]. (ABE)

- *Today, workers are in transition, and worker training needs to be a lifelong thing. This is finally receiving some attention at the federal and state levels.* (BCBS)

- *One of the most important questions for employers to consider with respect to employee development is "Does the individual continue to grow in the company and demonstrate a continuing willingness and ability to learn?"* (SLCC)

- *Approaches to workforce literacy should focus on the ideas of developing workers who can continue to learn, rather than on just improving basic skill deficits.* (SLCC)

- *The project needs to be more visible in the community.* (BCBS)

- *We can serve as resources for one another, and we need to work together collaboratively in the community, and do our own PR work.* (BCBS)

- *We will continue to utilize both of the education partners as providers of on-site skills enhancement.* (BCBS)

- *The community needs to be educated about the broader definition of literacy today; it's not just reading and writing anymore. Workers need to have skills that will allow them to adapt to a changing workplace and become lifelong learners.* (SLCC)

---

[4] St. Louis Public Schools Adult Basic Education Program

- *There is a paucity of understanding about adult literacy in St. Louis companies. It isn't perceived as a high need. It's not clear what will cause the business community to wake up.* (BCBS)

- *The role of adult basic education in the workplace is not clearly defined. From the perspective of ABE providers, their programs are a constant in the community, and they offer valuable academic support services for companies. Companies need to know that ABE programs exist and what they can offer.* (ABE)

V. OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS

Program Development

Participant and instructor evaluations of STAT courses and workshops indicated that participants gave high ratings to the training activities and value the opportunities provided by the program. This was reinforced by classroom observations, participant responses to the Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire, and comments made by focus group participants.

- Classes observed were extremely well planned and well received. Objectives were clear and there was a high level of interest, participation, and attention to task on the part of participants. All instructors were well prepared, warm, friendly, and accepting.

- The mean response to item 5 of the Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire was 4.21, indicating that instructors, instructional methods, and materials were perceived by participants to be of high quality.

- Focus group participants found the classes helpful in developing new skills and preparing for the Selection Exercises. Instructors were highly rated, and the fact that they were all external to BCBSMo was seen as a strength.

Other perceived strengths of the training program include the following: flexible scheduling; small class size; voluntary attendance; availability of staff; various teaching styles; support from some managers for attending classes; support from classmates with similar needs; and individual assistance. While participants felt that the training was probably helpful in improving their on-the-job skills, the relationship was less obvious.

When asked to identify ways in which the program could be improved, individual participants and supervisors gave the following suggestions:

- Start some college studies.
- Offer more advanced material once you meet company standards in Selection Exercises, Phase I.
- Provide more Saturday or after-work sessions.
- Have more sessions.
- Make sure materials are error free.

- Hold training during working hours.
- Provide more test-taking practice.
- Make sure program mailings get to workers.
- Have a class on office etiquette for everyone.
- Include supervisors/managers in the information loop
- Provide supervisors/managers with feedback on program progress
- Provide managers with an overview of skills taught
- Include an overview of STAT as part of the orientation for new employees
- Market the program as a vehicle for personal/career development rather than remediation
- Change the project name to remove the association with remediation
- Separate professional development from selection exercises
- Provide incentives for participation
- Advertise program and individual accomplishments--accomplishment board, testimonials from participants, newsletter
- Provide a second level of skills upgrades for employees above the clerical level
- Reach production workers
- Videotape classes for home study use
- Continue the use of practice tests
- Provide classes in sales, communication, time management, organizational skills
- Have brown bag lunches

Three external reviewers and two internal reviewers reviewed the following curriculum packets: Perception/Concentration; Comprehension/Problem Solving; Memory Skills; Math; and Writing. Each packet was reviewed for relevancy of the topic, quality of organization, appropriateness of reading level, and transferability. In general, the reviewers gave high ratings to the materials.

BCBSMo administrators interviewed reported that the federal grant and three-member partnership has benefited the company by increasing the scope of the program and focusing additional resources and expertise on the effort. They also felt that the program had a tremendous confidence-building effect on participants, with some are even planning to continue their educations. This has in turn helped morale and productivity and is in the best interest of the company. Other strengths of the program, according to these administrators, include instructors being from outside the company, the sensitivity of instructors, and the voluntary nature of the program.

BCBSMo administrators expressed some disappointment that the external component has not worked as planned, however, they explained that the employment needs of the company changed over the last few years, and an external pool of qualified applicants is less critical than it was previously.

Impact on Individual Workers

The program benefited individual workers in several ways, including increased skills, increased scores on the Selection Exercises, and increased self-confidence.

- Participating workers showed significant increases in basic skills acquisition after completing STAT courses in reading, math, and punctuation/grammar. Based on pre-post gain scores: 95 percent improved their reading skills; 86 percent showed improvements in math skills; 81 percent improved their punctuation/grammar skills; and 85 percent showed overall increases in basic skills acquisition.

- From 64 percent to 88 percent of STAT participants improved their scores on the Selection Exercises--88 percent improved their scores on the perception/ concentration section of the exercises, 80 percent improved their scores on the memory subtest, 70 percent improved their scores in numerical computation and written expression, and 64 percent improved in the area of comprehension/problem solving.

- Sixty-three percent of STAT participants who re-took one or more sections of the Selection Exercises subsequently met company standards for continued employment and eligibility to compete for promotions. Furthermore, for the subtests of perception/concentration, written expression, and comprehension/problem solving, participants who completed a related STAT course before retaking one or more sections of the test received significantly higher gain scores than those who did not.

- Ninety-two percent of participants felt that participation in the program had increased their self-confidence; 60 percent indicated that it had increased their self-confidence to a great extent. This was reinforced by participant and supervisors comments in the focus groups conducted as part of the formative evaluation.

Impact on the Company

Summative evaluation data suggest that some modest improvements in employee performance and productivity as well as increased customer satisfaction ratings may be attributable in part to program participation.

- From 1991 to 1994, the percentage of STAT participants whose performance ratings improved (49%) was considerably greater than the percentage whose scores declined (20%) or stayed the same (31%).
- A considerably higher proportion of STAT participants received improved productivity ratings (46%) over a four-year period as compared to those whose ratings declined (4%). Fifty percent of the ratings stayed the same from 1991 to 1994.
- Over a four-year period, 42 percent of STAT participants sampled in the customer service department received improved customer satisfaction ratings, while none received lower ratings. The ratings for 58 percent stayed the same.

According to BCBSMo administrators:

- *The project has made a difference at Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri. It has filled a need to provide academic support to non-managerial staff, and had helped to change the nature and importance of employee input into company operations--the company will conduct employee climate surveys, all-employee meetings will be held, and employee feedback groups will be instituted. By the end of April 1995, every employee will have a development plan.*
- *Employees need developmental support, want it, and STAT has played an important role. This support needs to be provided into 1995 and beyond. It may become a more internal process in the future.*

Finally, the program has been institutionalized. Starting in January of 1995, STAT workshops will be offered on company time. The program has been restructured from a classroom instruction model to a more individualized, self-paced, computer-assisted approach provided in a multi-station basic skills lab. Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri purchased all of the hardware for the lab and some of the software, and the grant supported the costs of additional basic skills software. The system is now being accessed by other Blue Cross and Blue Shield offices in Missouri.

APPENDICES

A. STAT Course Catalog, Fall 1993

B. Guidelines for Formative Evaluation

C. Classroom Observation Form

D. Interview Format

E. Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire

F. Focus Group Guidelines and Discussion Form for Participants

G. Focus Group Discussion Form for Supervisors

H. Guidelines for Summative Evaluation

I. Additional Comments: Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire

J. Curriculum Analysis Forms

K. Summary: STAT Partners' Meeting

APPENDIX A.

STAT Course Catalog, Fall 1993

Course Catalog
Fall 1993

WHAT IS STAT?

Skills Today for Advancement Tomorrow

STAT is an educational partnership of BlueCross BlueShield of Missouri, St. Louis Community College, and St. Louis Public Schools.

STAT OFFERS:

FREE educational services for BCBSMo employees

- ✔ Get ready for college courses
- ✔ Brush up on Writing, Math, Memory Skills, etc.
- ✔ Prepare for taking or re-taking Selection Exercises
- ✔ Individual tutoring
- ✔ Take-home study packets
- ✔ Educational counseling

The STAT staff, all experienced St. Louis Community College teachers, seek to meet your educational needs and varied working schedules.

We offer classes/workshops at lunchtime, after work, and some Saturday mornings. Begin your future and register for STAT.

REGISTRATION - Mail in your registration by August 12, or, if you have registration problems or questions, register in person at the following locations:

BCBSMo Plaza
August 11th
Missouri Room
11:00 am - 2:00 pm

One City Centre
August 12th
8th floor HR conference room
11:00 am - 2:00 pm

QUESTIONS? Call Lorna Finch (ext. 34779), Pam Richards, (ext. 34394), or Carolyn Martini (ext. 34050)

STAT CLASSES

Reading Skills Brush-Up — Overview of reading strategies, including reading tables & graphs, comprehension, application, and drawing conclusions. All course materials will be supplied.

Math Skills Brush-Up — Practice on math concepts and computation exercises in whole numbers, signed numbers, fractions, decimals, percents, and word problems All course materials will be supplied.

Punctuation & Grammar Skills — Brush up on business English, including spelling, punctuation, capitalization, grammar, and word usage. Sharpen your editing and proofreading skills. All course materials will be supplied.

Business Writing Skills — Introducing the POWER writing method:

Planning **O**rganizing **W**riting **E**valuating **R**evising

Learn to write power letters, memos and reports. Punctuation and Grammar Skills class strongly recommended to prepare for this class. All course materials will be supplied.

STAT WORKSHOPS

Effective Communication Skills — Four-session workshop covering essential communication skills — questioning, listening, responding, and presenting. Learn to say what you mean! (4 hours)

Word Power — Looking for just the right word? This workshop will help you learn to increase your vocabulary in just two sessions. (2 hours)

Improve Your Memory — Two sessions on memory techniques. Useful tips on memory improvement and practice exercises will be covered. (2 hours)

Improve Your Concentration — It's all a mind game and you can master some game rules in just one session. (1 hour)

Problem Solving — In two sessions learn to approach a problem in a logical, systematic way. Practice the six basic steps to break a problem into manageable parts. (2 hours)

Study Skills and Test Anxiety — Learn a system in just two sessions that not only will help you make better use of your study time but also will cut down on your test anxiety. (2 hours)

Introduction to the Personal Computer — Basic information on the PC including keyboard layout, etc. You will also receive a brief introduction to some common PC applications. (DATES TO BE ANNOUNCED)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STAT SELF-STUDY PACKETS

Business Letter-Writing Exercises — Self-study practice on writing efficient, effective business letters. **(The practice letters may be reviewed by an instructor at the employee's request.)**

Perception/Concentration Skills — Self-study exercises to provide practice in proofreading, code matching, and attending to details.

Memory Skills — Self-study exercises to provide practice in workplace memory and application skills.

One-on-one assistance will be available for all STAT classes, workshops, and self-study packets.

STAT REGISTRATION FORM

Name:_____ Department:_____

Mail Route:_____ Extension:_____

Please sign me up for the STAT class(es) checked below:

Reading Skills Brush-Up :

Section	Place	Days	Time	Dates
❑ R01	1831 Chestnut	Tue/Thu	4:30 - 6:00 pm	8/31 . 9/23/93
❑ R02	1831 Chestnut	Mon/Wed	11:00 - 12:00 pm	8/30 - 10/8/93
❑ R03	1831 Chestnut	Mon/Wed	12:00 - 1:00 pm	8/30 - 10/8/93
❑ R04	One City Centre	Tue/Thu	11:30 - 12:30 pm	8/31 - 10/7/93

Math Skills Brush-Up :

Section	Place	Days	Time	Dates
❑ M01	1831 Chestnut	Mon/Wed	4:30 - 6:00 pm	8/30 . 9/27/93
❑ M02	1831 Chestnut	Tue/Thu	11:00 - 12:00 pm	8/31 - 10/7/93
❑ M03	1831 Chestnut	Tue/Thu	12:00 - 1:00 pm	8/31 - 10/7/93
❑ M05	One City Centre	Mon/Wed	12:30 - 1:30 pm	8/30 - 10/8/93

Punctuation & Grammar Skills :

Section	Place	Days	Time	Dates
❑ P01	1831 Chestnut	Mon/Wed	4:30 - 6:00 pm	8/30 . 9/27/93
❑ P02	1831 Chestnut	Tue/Thu	11:00 - 12:00 pm	8/31 - 10/7/93
❑ P03	1831 Chestnut	Tue/Thu	12:00 - 1:00 pm	8/31 - 10/7/93
❑ P04	One City Centre	Mon/Wed	11:30 - 12:30 pm	8/30 - 10/8/93

Business Writing Skills : *Please note Business Writing start dates.* Punctuation & Grammar class is strongly recommended before enrolling in Business Writing.

Section	Place	Days	Time	Dates
❑ W01	1831 Chestnut	Mon/Wed	4:30 - 6:00 pm	**10/11** - 11/3/93
❑ W02	1831 Chestnut	Tue/Thu	11:00 - 12:00 pm	**10/12** - 11/18/93
❑ W03	1831 Chestnut	Tue/Thu	12:00 - 1:00 pm	**10/12** - 11/18/93
❑ W05	One City Centre	Mon/Wed	12:30 - 1:30 pm	**10/11** - 11/17/93

Please sign me up for the STAT workshop(s) checked below

Effective Communication: (4 Hours)

Section	Place	Days	Time	Dates
❑ 01	1831 Chestnut	Mon. Tue. Wed. Thur	12:00 - 1:00 pm	9/13 - 9/16/93
❑ 02	1831 Chestnut	Sat.	8:30 am - 12:30 pm	9/18/93
❑ 03	One City Centre	Mon. Tue. Wed. Thur	12:00 - 1:00 pm	9/20 - 9/23/93
❑ 04	1831 Chestnut	Mon. Tue. Wed. Thur	11:00 - 12:00 pm	10/11 - 10/14/93
❑ 05	One City Centre	Mon. Tue. Wed. Thur	11:30 - 12:30 pm	10/18 - 10/21/93

Return Registration Form to Sally Bartsokas, HRD - 8004, By August 12

Word Power: (2 Hours)

Section	Place	Days	Time	Dates
❑ 01	1831 Chestnut	Mon, Tue	11:00 - 12:00 pm	10/11 - 10/12/93
❑ 02	One City Centre	Wed, Thur	11:30 - 12:30 pm	10/13 - 10/14/93

Improve Your Memory : (2 Hours)

Section	Place	Days	Time	Dates
❑ 01	1831 Chestnut	Mon, Tue	12:00 - 1:00 pm	9/13 - 9/14/93
❑ 02	One City Centre	Mon, Tue	12:00 - 1:00 pm	9/20 - 9/21/93
❑ 03	1831 Chestnut	Mon, Tue	11:00 - 12:00 pm	10/4 - 10/5/93
❑ 04	One City Centre	Wed, Thur	11:30 - 12:30 pm	10/6 - 10/7/93

Improve Your Concentration: (2 Hours)

Section	Place	Days	Time	Dates
❑ 01	1831 Chestnut	Mon, Tue	11:00 - 12:00 pm	9/27 - 9/28/93
❑ 02	One City Centre	Wed, Thur	11:30 - 12:30 pm	9/29 - 9/30/93
❑ 03	1831 Chestnut	Mon, Tue	12:00 - 1:00 pm	10/11 - 10/12/93
❑ 04	One City Centre	Wed, Thur	12:30 - 1:30 pm	10/13 - 10/14/93

Problem Solving: (2 Hours)

Section	Place	Days	Time	Dates
❑ 01	1831 Chestnut	Wed, Thur	11:00 - 12:00 pm	9/22 - 9/23/93
❑ 02	One City Centre	Mon, Tue	11:00 - 12:00 pm	9/20 - 9/21/93
❑ 03	1831 Chestnut	Mon, Tue	12:00 - 1:00 pm	10/4 - 10/5/93
❑ 04	One City Centre	Wed, Thur	11:30 - 12:30 pm	10/6 - 10/7/93

Study Skills and Test Anxiety: (2 Hours)

Section	Place	Days	Time	Dates
❑ 01	1831 Chestnut	Tue	12:00 - 1:00 pm	9/14/93
❑ 02	One City Centre	Wed	12:00 - 1:00 pm	9/15/93
❑ 03	1831 Chestnut	Tue	11:00 - 12:00 pm	10/12/93
❑ 04	One City Centre	Wed	11:30 - 12:30 pm	10/13/93

Please send me the STAT self-study packet(s) checked below:

❑ ***Business Letter-Writing Exercises Packet***

❑ ***Perception/Concentration Skills Packet***

❑ ***Memory Skills Packet***

Return Registration Form to Sally Bartsokas, HRD - 8004, By August 12

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX B.

Guidelines for Formative Evaluation

GUIDELINES FOR FORMATIVE EVALUATION

PROJECT VARIABLES	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	EVALUATION CRITERIA/ ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES
1. PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	Are the goals and objectives clear? To what extent do all partners have a common understanding of goals and objectives? To what extent are the project's activities related to stated goals and objectives? Are the objectives measurable?	*Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)* *Final Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)* *Interviews/focus groups with STAT Steering Committee, Peer Support Group, selected staff, s supervisors, and selected participants (Guidelines for Focus Group Leaders, Focus Group Feed*
2. PROJECT ORGANIZATION, LEADERSHIP, AND COMMUNICATION	Is the project well organized? Are roles and responsibilities clear and understood by all members of the partnership? Are lines of communication open, and do members of the partnership feel comfortable sharing information with one another? Are project staff well oriented and trained? Is the project operating on schedule?	*Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)* *Final Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)* *Interviews/focus groups with STAT Steering Committee, Peer Support Group, selected staff, s supervisors, and selected participants (Guidelines for Focus Group Leaders, Focus Group Feed*

83

PROJECT VARIABLES	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	EVALUATION CRITERIA/ ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES
3. RECRUITMENT AND SELECTION OF PARTICIPANTS	Are recruitment strategies reaching the BCBSMo workers for whom they are intended?	*Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)*
		Final Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)
	Are workers responding to the project in sufficient numbers?	*Interviews/focus groups with STAT Steering Committee, selected staff, and selected participants (Guidelines for Focus Group Leaders, Focus Group Feedback Form)*
	Are selection criteria well defined and appropriate?	
	How might recruitment and selection procedures be improved?	
4. PARTICIPANT TRAINING	Do training activities match real needs?	*Interviews/focus groups with STAT Steering Committee, Peer Support Group, selected staff, supervisors, and selected participants (Guidelines for Focus Group Leaders, Focus Group Fe*
	Are instructors, instructional methods, and materials appropriate and well received by the participants?	*Individual participant evaluations of each course, workshop, self-study packet, and individualized learning experience (Existing forms, adaptations of existing forms)*
	Are training activities scheduled at convenient times?	*Instructor evaluations of each course and workshop (To be developed)*
		Observations of selected training activities (Training Observation Format)
	Are training activities successful in improving workplace literacy skills?	
	How might training activities be improved?	

PROJECT VARIABLES	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	EVALUATION CRITERIA/ ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES
5. PARTICIPANT SUPPORT SERVICES	What support services are available to participants? To what extent have participants taken advantage of these services? Do the participants find the services helpful? What other support services do participants need?	*Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)* *Final Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)* *Interview/focus groups with STAT Steering Committee, Peer Support Group, selected staff, s supervisors, and selected participants (Guidelines for Focus Group Leaders, Focus Group Fe*
6. PEER SUPPORT GROUP	How many BCBSMo workers are participating in the Peer Support Group? What is the nature of their participation? How might this component be strengthened?	*Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)* *Final Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)* *Interviews/focus groups with STAT Steering Committee, Peer Support Group, selected staff, supervisors, and selected participants (Guidelines for Focus Group Leaders, Focus Group Fe*
7. DISSEMINATION	To what extent is information on project activities and outcomes disseminated to the community? Are dissemination activities effective in increasing awareness of the need for and value of workplace literacy? How can dissemination strategies be improved?	*Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)* *Final Project Evaluation Questionnaire (Forms 1-4)* *Interviews/focus groups with STAT Steering Committee, Peer Support Group, selected staff supervisors, and selected participants (Guidelines for Focus Group Leaders, Focus Group F*

APPENDIX C.

Classroom Observation Form

STAT PROJECT
TRAINING OBSERVATION FORM

Course/Workshop:_____

Date/Times/Location:_____ No. of Participants: _____

	High				Low
Clarity of objectives:	5	4	3	2	1
Level of interest of participants:	5	4	3	2	1
Level of participation of participants:	5	4	3	2	1
Level of attention to task of participants:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality/appropriateness of teaching methods:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of instructional materials:	5	4	3	2	1

Description of Activities:

Time Period #1 (10 minutes)

Time Period #2 (10 minutes)

Time Period #3 (10 minutes)

APPENDIX D.

Interview Format

INTERVIIEW QUESTIONS
STAT PROJECT INTERIM EVALUATION

(1) To what extent are the project goals and objectives clear?

(2) To what extent are the project's activities related to stated goals and objectives?

(3) To what extent is the project well organized?

(4) To what extent are lines of communication open, and do members of the partnership feel comfortable sharing information with one another?

(5) To what extent are recruitment strategies reaching the BCBSMo workers for whom they are intended?

(6) To what extent are workers responding to the project in sufficient numbers?

(7) To what extent are training activities successful in improving workplace literacy skills?

(8) How might training activities be improved?

(9) What additional support services are available to participants?

(10) To what extent do the participants find the services helpful?

(11) To what extent do BCBSMo workers participate in project planning and review?

(12) To what extent are the project's dissemination activities effective in increasing awareness of the need for and value of workplace literacy?

(13) What are the project's greatest strengths?

(14) How might the project be improved?

APPENDIX E.

Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: February 16, 1994

TO: Current and past STAT participants

FROM: STAT staff

RE: STAT interim evaluation

We want to evaluate Human Resources Development's STAT (Skills Today for Advancement Tomorrow) program, and we need your feedback.

Please take a few moments to complete the enclosed survey. We appreciate your comments as this helps us design classes and learning materials to meet your needs and interests. We will share the results of this evaluation with you.

Return the survey to Pam Richards, HRD-8004, by February 25.

We look forward to hearing from you. Thank you.

INTERIM EVALUATION FORM

Please take a few minutes to complete the following brief questionnaire. Your ratings and comments will help us strengthen STAT's strategies and activities.

		To a Great Extent				Not at All
(1)	To what extent are STAT's goals and objectives clear?	5	4	3	2	1
(2)	To what extent is STAT well organized?	5	4	3	2	1
(3)	To what extent are recruitment strategies effective?	5	4	3	2	1
(4)	To what extent do training activities match real needs?	5	4	3	2	1
(5)	To what extent are instructors, instructional methods, and materials of high quality?	5	4	3	2	1
(6)	To what extent are training activities scheduled at convenient times?	5	4	3	2	1
(7)	To what extent are training activities successful in improving workplace literacy skills?	5	4	3	2	1
(8)	To what extent are STAT support services, such as Skills Center, self-study exercises, etc., helpful to participants?	5	4	3	2	1
(9)	To what extent have you taken advantage of these services?	5	4	3	2	1
(10)	To what extent have you found these services helpful?	5	4	3	2	1
(11)	To what extent has your participation in STAT increased your self confidence?	5	4	3	2	1
(12)	To what extent has your participation in STAT helped you to become a better worker?	5	4	3	2	1
(13)	In what ways can STAT be improved?	5	4	3	2	1

Other Comments:

Return to Pam Richards, HRD-8004, by February 25, 1994

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: February 16, 1994

TO: Unit managers and managers

FROM: STAT staff

RE: STAT interim evaluation

We want to evaluate Human Resources Development's STAT (Skills Today for Advancement Tomorrow) program, and we need your feedback as a supervisor.

Please take a few moments to complete the enclosed survey. Your comments will help us measure how well we reach and meet the needs of BCBSMo's employees. We will share the results of this evaluation with you.

Return the survey to Pam Richards, HRD-8004, by February 25.

We look forward to hearing from you. Thank you.

INTERIM EVALUATION FORM

Please take a few minutes to complete the following brief questionnaire. Your ratings and comments will help us strengthen STAT's strategies and activities.

		To a Great Extent				Not at All
(1)	To what extent are you aware of the STAT project?	5	4	3	2	1
(2)	To what extent are STAT's goals and objectives clear?	5	4	3	2	1
(3)	To what extent is STAT well organized?	5	4	3	2	1
(4)	To what extent do STAT staff seem to be well qualified?	5	4	3	2	1
(5)	To what extent are recruitment strategies reaching the BCBSMo workers for whom they are intended?	5	4	3	2	1
(6)	To what extent are training activities successful in improving workplace literacy skills?	5	4	3	2	1
(7)	To what extent are the other STAT support services ,such as Skills Center, self-study exercises, etc., by STAT helpful to participants?	5	4	3	2	1
(8)	How might STAT's activities be improved?					

Other Comments?

Return to Pam Richards, HRD-8004, by February 25, 1994

APPENDIX F.

Focus Group Guidelines and Discussion Form for Participants

STAT PROGRAM
GUIDELINES FOR FOCUS GROUP LEADERS

(1) Have participants take a few minutes to complete the Focus Group Discussion Form. Be sure to tell them that it is an exercise designed to help them organize their thoughts about the program and that the completed forms will not be collected.

(2) Have participants spend approximately 15 minutes discussing ways in which they have benefitted from the program. Have a recorder list their comments on newsprint or a chalk board.

(3) Use the same process to identify and discuss perceived strenghts (15 minutes) and weaknesses (15 minutes) of the program.

(4) Make a quick assessment of the extent to which responses have addressed intended questions below (all questions will not be appropriate for all groups). Spend the last 15 minutes directing a few specific questions to the group designed to solicit discussion of the points not covered earlier.

- Project Goals and Objectives

  Are the project goals and objectives clear?
  To what extent do all partners have a common understanding of goals and objectives?
  To what extent are the project's activities related to stated goals and objectives?
  Are the objectives measurable?

- Project Organization

  Is the project well organized?
  Are roles and responsibilities clear and understood by all members of the partnership?
  Are lines of communication open, and do members of the partnership feel comfortable sharing information with one another?
  Are project staff well trained?
  Is the project operating on schedule?

- Recruitment and Selection of Participants

  Are recruitment strategies reaching the BCBSMo workers for whom they are intended?
  Are workers responding to the project in sufficient numbers?
  Are selection criteria well defined and appropriate?
  How might recruitment and selection procedures be improved?

- Participant Training

  Do training activities match real needs?
  Are instructors, instructional methods, and materials appropriate?
  Are training activities scheduled at convenient times?
  Are training activities successful in improving workplace literacy skills?
  How might training activities be improved?

- Participant Support Services

  What other support services are available to participants?
  To what extent have participants taken advantage of these services?
  Do the participants find the services helpful?
  What other support services do participants need?

- Peer Involvement in Project Planning and Review

  In what ways have other BCBSMo workers participated in project planning and review?
  What is the nature of their participation?
  How might this component be strengthened?

- Dissemination

  To what extent is information on project activities and outcomes disseminated to the community?
  Are dissemination activities effective in increasing awareness of the need for and value of workplace literacy?
  How can dissemination strategies be improved?

- Overall Benefits for Participants

  In what ways have participants benefitted from the program?
  Personally? In their jobs?

- Overall Strengths and Weaknesses

  What are the overall strengths of the program?
  How can the program be improved?

STAT PROGRAM
FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION FORM

(1) In what ways have you benefitted from the STAT program?

-
-
-
-
-
-

(2) What are some of the greatest strengths of the program?

-
-
-
-
-
-

(3) In what ways could the program be improved?

-
-
-
-
-
-

APPENDIX G.

Focus Group Discussion Form for Supervisors

STAT PROGRAM
FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION FORM

(1) How familiar are you with the STAT Program?

(2) Have any of your employees participated in STAT?

(3) In what ways do you think employees have benefitted from the STAT program?

-
-
-
-
-

(4) To what extent has STAT met your needs as a supervisor?

(5) What are some of the greatest strengths of the program?

-
-
-
-
-

(6) In what ways could the program be improved?

-
-
-
-
-

APPENDIX H.

Guidelines for Summative Evaluation

GUIDELINES FOR SUMMATIVE EVALUATION

GOAL	PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	EVALUATION CRITERIA/ ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES
1. Improve the productivity, efficiency and cost effectiveness of the BCBSMo workforce.	1. Recruit, counsel and train 300 BCBSMo workers in the workplace specific basic skills and 70 BCBSMo workers in the pre-technical "Imaging" Training program. Each participant will commit to a jointly developed individualized learning plan and complete at least one or more training modules.	1.1 To what extent do individual workers benefit from participating in the STAT project?	70 percent of STAT participants will show increased basic skill levels as demonstrated by pre-test and post-test assessments. *Pre-post gains on the Reading Brush-Up, Math Brush-Up, and/or Punctuation and Grammar Tests* 70% of participants who successfully complete the learning plan will be eligible to compete for promotions. *Acceptable scores on the Selection Exercises* Due to the increased range and scope of skills acquired through training, 80 percent of participants will be able to retain jobs (through other job placements in cases where technology replaces positions and downsizing results). *Job retention rate, compared to percentage overall who lost jobs* Participating workers will report increases in self-esteem and empowerment. *Feedback received on the Interim and Final project evaluation questionnaires; course evaluation form*

GOAL	PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	EVALUATION CRITERIA/ ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES
		1.2 To what extent does BCBSMo benefit from the STAT project?	70 percent of the trained workers will demonstrate improved performance appraisals. *Supervisor ratings (Means to be determined)* 70 percent of those served will demonstrate increased productivity and improved quality of work. Supervisor ratings, attendance reports, and performance quotas will all be analyzed to document these increased abilities. *Supervisor ratings; pre-post improvement in attendance, punctuality; retention, and meeting quotas* 70 percent of those workers who work in customer service positions will achieve improved feedback as to customer satisfaction. Customer satisfaction vs. customer complaints will be compared and analyzed for STAT participants. *(To be determined)*
2. Develop a recruitment and training referral system whereby unemployed, disadvantaged adult learners may acquire those skills necessary to successfully compete as applicants for employment at BCBSMo or similar work environments.	2. Develop a new referral system whereby 60 prospective workers may be recruited, counseled, and trained in workplace skills that will enable them to successfully compete for jobs in the BCBSMo health care benefits or related data-intensive and customer service industries. (Prospective workers who obtain satisfactory scores on the Selection Exercises will meet this criterion.)	2.1 To what extent do prospective workers benefit from participating in the STAT project?	70 percent of participating prospective workers will show increased basic skill levels as demonstrated by pre-test and post-test assessments *Pre-post gains on the Reading Brush-Up, Math Brush-Up, and/or Punctuation and Grammar tests* 70 percent of participating prospective workers who complete the jointly developed individualized learning plan and retake the Selection Exercises will be able to successfully compete for BCBSMo employment. *Acceptable scores on the Selection Exercises* Participating prospective workers will report increases in self-esteem and empowerment. *Feedback received on the interim and final project evaluation questionnaires; course evaluation form*
		2.2 To what extent does BCBSMo benefit from providing STAT services to prospective workers?	BCBSMo will have a new pool of qualified job candidates. *A record of the number and types of prospective workers*

GOAL	PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	EVALUATION CRITERIA/ ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES
3. Develop model assessment and evaluation systems which will create new qualitative and quantitative measurement tools for health care benefits industry workers.	3. Develop assessment instruments for each course, the individualized instruction component, the self-study packets, and the seminars which are provided through STAT. A minimum of one assessment instrument will be developed and available for dissemination for each instructional component.	3. To what extent do the project's assessment and evaluation systems provide new measurement tools for the health care benefits industry?	*Analysis of assessment and evaluation systems by STAT Steering Committee and at least two outside reviewers in the health care benefits industry*

GOAL	PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	EVALUATION CRITERIA/ ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES
4. Develop, validate, refine, reproduce and disseminate systematic basic skills curricula that are competency based and transferable to other similar industries.	4. Develop, validate, refine and reproduce systematic basic skills curricula with a minimum of one each for reading, writing, computation skills, and imaging pre-technical training made available for dissemination.	4. To what extent are the project's curriculum materials valid, competency based, and transferable to similar settings?	*Analysis of curriculum materials by STAT Steering Committee and at least two outside reviewers in the health care benefits industry*

GOAL	PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	EVALUATION CRITERIA/ ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES
5 Develop and implement methods for involving workers in all aspects of STAT's program development.	5. Develop and implement the Peer Support Group (PSG) whereby all BCBSMo workers may actively participate and volunteer as mentors and/or tutors for STAT enrollees. At least 50 workers will participate as PSG members.	5. To what extent are the workers involved in all aspects of the STAT project's development?	100 percent of all Peer Support Group members will provide input and feedback for STAT development and evaluation. *Documentation of BCBSMo workers participating in the Peer Support Group* *Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire* *Final Project Evaluation Questionnaire*

GOAL	PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	EVALUATION CRITERIA/ ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES
	6. All program objectives will be evaluated according to a plan to be developed jointly by STAT partners and the project evaluator.	6. To what extent are project evaluation strategies designed jointly by STAT partners and the project evaluator?	*Analysis by STAT Steering Committee*
		Other Questions:	
		To what extent does the project evaluation provide information that will help project developers refine project strategies?	*Analysis by STAT Steering Committee*
		To what extent does the project evaluation provide project developers with information on project worth?	*Analysis by STAT Steering Committee*

GOAL	PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE	EVALUATION QUESTIONS	EVALUATION CRITERIA/ ASSESSMENT STRATEGIES
	7. On-going workplace literacy activities will be institutionalized and continued at the conclusion of the federally-supported project activities.	7. To what extent is the program continued at the conclusion of the initial project period?	*Interviews of members of the STAT Steering Committee during the initial project funding period; interviews of members of the STAT Steering Committee after the initial project funding period*

APPENDIX I.

Additional Comments: Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire

Additional Comments: Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire

Comments and Suggestions: STAT Participants

In what ways can STAT be improved?

- *Don't know.*
- *I think it's Great. Start some college studies. I need it.*
- *The only suggestion I had was not have back-to-back classes such and Math (lunch time) & English during same week period. To my knowledge it has already been changed. Thanks again.*
- *More Saturday or after-work sessions.*
- *Maybe more advanced material once you pass the first phase.*
- *Have more sessions--don't try to rush or cram more into short sessions, sometimes 2 or 3 days are not enough. Also, would prefer more lunch hour sessions.*
- *Would prefer having STAT classes at One City Center.*
- *Allowing math students to use calculators during class/especially testing.*
- *One way is that you can improve by letting the test Start as you finish one part of the test. And let those people who may have gotten a low acceptable in one part take that part over right away and stop making everyone way a whole year before they can take it again.*
- *Self study exercises are very helpful but frustrating when you don't agree with the answers and they also don't tell you why their answer is correct.*
- *Get more classes going!*
- *Classes during my lunch hour might enable me to be able to attend. Still have backlog in my department.*

Other Comments

- *Training activities should not be on our lunch hour or after work. It should be during working hours. I feel we would benefit better during working hours not after when your tired from a longs day work or at lunch when your hungry. You cannot eat and do the training exercises at the same time.*
- *I have not yet utilized your services. Will be though.*
- *Management should be more understanding of people needing lunch time for classes. In Client Service, they do not want to help you attend classes!!*
- *Since my participation in STAT so far has been minimal--I hope to get a chance to reevaluate after I attend workshops I scheduled in March!*

- *The memory program should be related to the actual STAT exercise.*
- *The Instructor--(rating of 5); the memory class was fun and relaxing--(rating of 5); and the presentation was great--(rating of 5).*
- *Extend the time for the workshops, materials that needs to be covered is too rushed.*
- *I need to take/find the time to use the program to benefit from these services.*
- *I only briefly had contact with STAT personnel, and they helped me in a more guidance type of situation. I haven't participated in any of the training activities.*
- *The only thing I've noticed is the classes seem to dwindle in size, but I don't know why a lot of people lose interest. I did not. A class of about 12 people dwindled to 2 by the end of the class.*
- *You are very helpful, but it's still hard for me to understand the problem, maybe I am to hard on myself.*
- *I feel that the negative connotations associated with the STAT program are detrimental to its success. If an employee feels they are going to lose their jobs (and that is what is being expressed by employers) based on the testing and skills assessment, it is highly unlikely that their capacity to learn is at its best. stress is a detriment to learning. Unfortunately, I don't think the STAT program has control over the employee impressions and that comes from H.R.*
- *The instructor really made the difference. He is the best instructor I have had teach a course thus far at BCBS.*
- *Would like to have more help deciding on greater education.*
- *If managers realized employees were taking the extra effort to participate in STAT, they would realize their desire to grow and learn. I know STAT has had a positive effect on my job.*
- *That Memory Test should be improved by giving a person more time to study the keys for the test. That part is ridiculous for studying 10 mins. Also need to improve on the letter skills for as you know what to right down but its not the way that the instructors want you to go about it.*
- *Improve and/or add additional.*
- *I appreciate the STAT classes and help. I just wish I had more time to take some courses.*
- *I've been through them, I'm waiting for some new ones.*
- *I would like to see classes available at One City Center more, especially the evening classes.*
- *Keep offering the courses for employees who are sincere about improving their work skills and education.*
- *The literature is hard to read in some of the books and answers are wrong, which can be discouraging to someone who thought they where right and saw the wrong answer.*

- *Good program--helpful to employee. Currently involved in completing other courses but plan to take advantage of program when finished.*
- *You cannot expect a person to learn from a 2 wk course what it takes a semester to teach. The pressure is too great and the time between the classes and test is even greater. Everyone is not test material but has the knowledge to do their job very well. Why should a person be expected to take a test to keep a job that they know instead of getting another one?*

- *Training at lunch time is fine, but, I can't always make each class, because of special projects that are assigned to me. Maybe if there could be some training classes Saturday mornings (That is just a suggestion), or during the working hours.*

- *I was always afraid to sign up for any classes fear of appearing stupid or dumb but after taking the memory class I am ready to sign up for more classes. I felt very relaxed and knew I was not the only one with mixed feelings. Pam was an excellent instructor and made the class fun. I learned a lot from her.*

- *More "Core Classes" during lunch times. If possible add breaks. Possibly more Saturday mid-morning classes (core classes).*

- *I think that the STAT program is great!*

Comments and Suggestions: Supervisors

How might STAT's activities be improved?

- *I have a new unit since mid-December. I would like to know what level was established for certain job classifications. I guess what I am asking for is that the criteria for all jobs be published.*

- *Need to know more about the program to comment.*

- *As there is minimal communication from the employee to the supervisor on this I cannot answer these questions. And I myself have not taken any STAT classes.*

- *I think that the STAT program has a very negative reputation, not due to their own actions but rather because Human Resources has given erroneous information regarding the tests that are given (Phase I & II). I'm sure if the STAT program were offered without the threatening undercurrents of job loss etc., it would be received much more readily and in the long run accomplish more for the company and the individuals that need skills enhancement. Human beings respond much better to positive reinforcement!*

Other Comments

- *Not sure who STAT staff are.*

- *Aren't reaching the people needed to reach.*

- *Know 2 individuals in our department who have found it very useful.*

- *I wasn't aware of program till October 93.*

- *Other questions unable to answer due to no experience working with the program.*

APPENDIX J.

Curriculum Analysis Forms

STAT PROJECT
ANALYSIS FORM: PERCEPTION/CONCENTRATION SKILLS CURRICULUM

Rate each of the perception/concentration skills curriculum components on the following criteria: relevancy of topic; quality of organization; appropriateness of reading level; and transferability.

(1) Accessing Information by Computer Code

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(2) Comparing Numbers and Letters

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(3) Reading Tables

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

STAT PROJECT
ANALYSIS FORM: COMPREHENSION/PROBLEM SOLVING CURRICULUM

Rate each of the reading curriculum components on the following criteria: relevancy of topic; quality of organization; appropriateness of reading level; and transferability. Assessment instruments are rated on the following criteria: appropriateness of items; appropriateness of reading level; and transferability.

(1) Understanding Written Material

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(2) Applying Policy

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(3) Classifying Subscriber and Provider Inquiries

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(4) Drawing Conclusions

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(5) Reading Pre Test

	High				Low
Appropriateness of Items:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(6) Reading Post Test

	High				Low
Appropriateness of Items:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

STAT PROJECT
ANALYSIS FORM: MEMORY SKILLS CURRICULUM

Rate each of the memory skills curriculum components on the following criteria: relevancy of topic; quality of organization; appropriateness of reading level; and transferability.

(1) Memory Skills Packet

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(2) Memory Skills Exercises

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

STAT PROJECT
ANALYSIS FORM: MATH CURRICULUM

Rate each of the math curriculum components on the following criteria: relevancy of topic; quality of organization; appropriateness of reading level; and transferability. Assessment instruments are rated on the following criteria: appropriateness of items; appropriateness of reading level; and transferability.

(1) Packet 1, Parts I and II (Whole Numbers)

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(2) Packet 2 (Signed Numbers)

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(3) Packet 3, Parts I and II (Fractions)

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(4) Packet 4, Parts I and II (Decimals)

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

STAT PROJECT
ANALYSIS FORM: WRITING CURRICULUM

Rate each of the writing curriculum components on the following criteria: relevancy of topic; quality of organization; appropriateness of reading level; and transferability. Assessment instruments are rated on the following criteria: appropriateness of items; appropriateness of reading level; and transferability.

(1) Packet 1 (Spelling, Punctuation, Capitalization)

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(2) Packet 2 (Punctuation)

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(3) Packet 3 (Grammar)

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(4) Packet 4 (Grammar)

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(5) Packet 5 (Word Usage)

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(6) Packet 6 (Cumulative Review)

	High				Low
Relevancy of Topic:	5	4	3	2	1
Quality of Organization:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(7) Writing Pre Test

	High				Low
Appropriateness of Items:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

(8) Writing Post Test

	High				Low
Appropriateness of Items:	5	4	3	2	1
Appropriateness of Reading Level:	5	4	3	2	1
Transferability:	5	4	3	2	1

Comments:

APPENDIX K.

Summary: STAT Partners' Meeting

Skills Today for Advancement Tomorrow (STAT) Program

Partner's Meeting Agenda

December 6, 1994; 9:00 - 11:00 a.m.

Alliance Blue Cross and Blue Shield

8th floor Human Resources

Chestnut Street Building

Review Project Outcomes

Review evaluator's brief abstract of outcomes;

Coordinators' Reports

Shared Perceptions of the Program by Each Partner

(what worked, what didn't work, what would you do again, what would you do differently)

Future Partnership Activities:

Collaboration

(Partners' perceptions of future needs, especially involving one another in meeting training needs at Alliance BCBSMO)

Dissemination

(How to contribute/share results and glean from other resources within the community)

Other Business

Adjourn

SUMMARY
STAT PARTNERS' MEETING
December 6, 1994

A meeting of STAT partners was held on December 6, 1994, from 9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m., at Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri. Attending were:

Wilma Sheffer, Project Director, St. Louis Community College
Randolph Scott, Vice President for Human Resources, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri
Del Hemsley, Director of ABE, St. Louis Public Schools
Lorna Finch, Project Coordinator, St. Louis Community College
Carolyn Martini, Project Coordinator, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri
Jeanne Bumberry, Project Teacher and Resource Assistant, St. Louis Community College
Sharon Slane, External Evaluator

A copy of the meeting agenda is attached. Four major topics covered were: review of project outcomes; shared perceptions of the project by each partner; future partnership activities and collaboration; and dissemination.

Review of Project Outcomes

The external evaluator gave a brief overview of the evaluation findings to date, including the following:

- Classes observed were extremely well planned and well received. Objectives were clear and there was a high level of interest, participation, and attention to task on the part of participants. All instructors were well prepared, warm, friendly, and accepting.

- The mean response to item 5 of the Interim Project Evaluation Questionnaire was 4.21, indicating that instructors, instructional methods, and materials were perceived by participants to be of high quality.

- STAT participants attending focus groups found the classes helpful in developing new skills and preparing for the Selection Exercises. Instructors were highly rated, and the fact that they were all external to BCBSMo was seen as a strength.

- Supervisors who attended a focus group felt that the project had been of great benefit to participating employees and that it should be expanded and

be more visible as a professional development strategy. They also felt that supervisors should play a much greater role in project planning and ongoing implementation.

Other perceived strengths of the project include: flexible scheduling; small class size; voluntary attendance; availability of staff; various teaching styles; support from some managers for attending classes; support from classmates with similar needs; and individual assistance. While participants felt that the training was probably helpful in improving their on-the-job skills, the relationship was less obvious. In this context, data on attendance, punctuality, supervisor performance ratings, productivity, and customer satisfaction are currently being analyzed in hopes of linking project participation and performance outcomes.

Shared Perceptions of the Project by Each Partner

Partners discussed their perceptions of what worked, what didn't work, and what they would do differently. The following comments and suggestions were generated[1]:

- *The project has made a difference at Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri. It has filled a need to provide academic support to non-managerial staff, and had helped to change the nature and importance of employee input into company operations--the company will conduct employee climate surveys, all-employee meetings will be held, and employee feedback groups will be instituted. By the end of April 1995, every employee will have a development plan.* (BCBS)[2]

- *Some things have worked marvelously well, some things haven't worked as well. If we had a chance, we'd do it again. Could we have done more? Probably, but we didn't.* (BCBS)

- *The project was key to helping employees get through a period of reorganization and downsizing, and it gave them something they could do about their situations.* (BCBS)

- *Employees need developmental support, want it, and STAT has played an important role. This support needs to be provided into 1995 and beyond. It may become a more internal process in the future.* (BCBS)

---

[1] These comments and suggestions are exact or nearly exact quotes from meeting participants.

[2] BCBS--Alliance Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri

- *A strength of the project from the perspective of the educational providers was that it was already in place in the company, and additional job audits weren't required.* (SLCC)[3]

- *Targeting services and focusing on a single department* [at a time], *rather than trying to serve everyone* [at the same time], *might have been more likely to lead to measurable impact. However, the company had a need to provide services company wide.* (SLCC)

- *Next time we might narrow our expectations.* (SLCC)

- *While peer involvement in project planning was built into the proposal, it didn't work because the culture wasn't right. The educational provider needs to be flexible enough to respond to the business culture.* (SLCC)

- *It was hoped that the curriculum could be computerized before the end of the project, but that didn't happen.* (SLCC)

- *The project would have benefited from much more interface and integration with managers and supervisors.* (SLCC)

- *The external component, designed to train potential workers, didn't get off the ground for a number of reasons, including a reorganization and hiring freeze at Blue Cross and Blue Shield that wasn't anticipated when the grant was initially submitted. Other problems encountered may have been related to Missouri's ABE structure. If this component had been implemented, it could have had some positive spinoffs, including benefits to the community.* (ABE)[4]

- [From the perspective of the ABE Program Director] *the project was another opportunity to broaden the horizons of some clients, but not directly related to employability in the community. It is difficult to related general training materials to employability. Clients want something that is tied to getting a job* [a concrete intervention and a definite connection to actual jobs]. (ABE)

- *Today, workers are in transition, and worker training needs to be a lifelong thing. This is finally receiving some attention at the federal and state levels.* (BCBS)

- *One of the most important questions for employers to consider with respect to employee development is "Does the individual continue to grow in the company and demonstrate a continuing willingness and ability to learn?"* (SLCC)

- *Approaches to workforce literacy should focus on the ideas of developing workers who can continue to learn, rather than on just improving basic skill deficits.* (SLCC)

---

[3] St. Louis Community College

[4] St. Louis Public Schools Adult Basic Education Program

Future Partnership Activities and Collaboration

Wilma Sheffer explained that three reports will be submitted to the federal government and the Regional ERIC office--a fiscal report (SLCC), an outcomes report (SLCC), and a final evaluation report (external evaluator). Other comments included the following:

- *The project needs to be more visible in the community.* (BCBS)
- *We can serve as resources for one another, and we need to work together collaboratively in the community, and do our own PR work.* (BCBS)
- *We will continue to utilize both of the education partners as providers of on-site skills enhancement.* (BCBS)

Dissemination

In addition to national dissemination efforts, dissemination of project information will occur through AAIM, United Way, RCGA, LIFT Missouri, and the Literacy Service Center serving the St. Louis area and Missouri. Other possibilities include issuing a joint press release, having a joint press conference, and participating in community talk shows. Other comments included the following:

- *The community needs to be educated about the broader definition of literacy today; it's not just reading and writing anymore. Workers need to have skills that will allow them to adapt to a changing workplace and become lifelong learners.* (SLCC)
- *There is a paucity of understanding about adult literacy in St. Louis companies. It isn't perceived as a high need. It's not clear what will cause the business community to wake up.* (BCBS)
- *The role of adult basic education in the workplace is not clearly defined. From the perspective of ABE providers, their programs are a constant in the community, and they offer valuable academic support services for companies. Companies need to know that ABE programs exist and what they can offer.* (ABE)